# KANSAS

# Summary of Quarterly IT Project Reports

http://da.ks.gov/kito/

# APRIL/MAY/JUNE 2009

# Quarterly Executive Summary Report

## Active Projects (Project Cost = $159,323,101)

| | |
|---|---|
| 16 | Projects in Good Standing |
| 4 | Projects in Good Standing/Infrastructure |
| 0 | On Hold |
| 3 | Project Caution Status |
| 0 | Project Alert Status |
| 1 | Project Recast |
| 2 | Project Recast/Infrastructure |
| 1 | Reporting Insufficient |
| **27** | **Total Number of Projects** |

**20**     **Projects are managed by a Kansas Certified Project Manager**

| | |
|---|---|
| 25 | Executive Branch Projects |
| 0 | Regents Projects |
| 0 | Judicial Projects |
| 2 | Legislative Branch Projects |
| **27** | **Total Projects by Branches and Regents** |

## Funding Source for Project Cost –
**(Does not include operational cost)**
42% Federal Funds
58% State Funds (Incl State General Funds and other State Funds)

## Planned Projects – For This Reporting Period`

**Education, Kansas State Department of (KSDE)**
   Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation – Estimated Total Project Costs: **$1,833,912**

## Approved Projects – For This Reporting Period (Est. Project Cost = $20,007,404)

**Historical Society, State**
   Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) – Estimated Project Costs: **$718,436**
**Labor, Department of (KDOL)**
   UIM Build and Deploy – Estimated Project Costs: **$18,957,746**
**Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)**
   KDOT Construction Management System Integration with IBM Expediter Project – Estimated Project Costs: **$331,222**

## Completed Projects – For This Reporting Period (Project Cost = $3,186,033)

**Correction, Department of  (KDOC)**                    (Total Project Cost may not be Final Cost)
   KDOC Enterprise Architecture Plan – Total Project Cost:  **$480,081**
**Education, Department of (KSDE)**
   Enterprise Data System to Support Decision Making and Reporting – Total Project Cost:  **$2,424,620**
**Legislature**
   Conversion to Exchange Server 2007 – Total Project Cost:  **$281,332**

## Introduction

This report is a summary of information with regard to major information technology projects. Information technology projects are defined as a major computer, telecommunications, or other information technology improvement with an estimated cost of $250,000 or more from any source of funding, over all fiscal years. The listed reports have approval of the respective branch Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO). The current CITO approved project plan on file with the Kansas Information Technology Office (KITO) is the benchmark for status monitoring.

In accordance with Information Technology Executive Council (ITEC) Policy 2500-Project Status Reporting including the reference to Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) Review of Active Projects Policy 2 - http://www.da.ks.gov/itec/documents/itecsjcitpolicy2.htm, these projects are monitored on a quarterly basis. The JCIT Policy 2 has established the following specific measures as their basis to evaluate project status.

The measures below are addressed individually however when a project experiences difficult problems the impact is reflected in more than one measure. JCIT has determined 30% to be the threshold when a project should be stopped. When a project deviates from its schedule or cost by 30% or more it shall be recast.

| JCIT Policy 2 Reference | JCIT Policy 2 Measurement | Documentation used for Analysis | JCIT Policy 2 Condition |
|---|---|---|---|
| **5.1 – Critical Path** | 10% to 20% behind schedule. | WBS | The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status. |
| | 20% or more behind schedule. | WBS | The project will be considered in a red or alert status. |
| **5.2 – Task Completion Rate** | Completion Rate of 80%-90%. | WBS | The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status. |
| | Completion Rate of 80% or less. | WBS | The project will be considered in a red or alert status. |
| **5.3 – Deliverable Completion Rate** | Completion Rate of 80%-90%. | WPI | The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status. |
| | Completion Rate of 80% or less. | WPI | The project will be considered in a red or alert status. |
| **5.4 – Issues** | | Change Mgmt Forms | Unresolved issues that have a negative impact on the project schedule, budget, or objectives should be concisely documented noting when the issue was presented to the sponsor and what actions have been initiated to achieve resolution. |
| **5.5 Cost – Deviation from Financial Plan** | 10%-20% deviation from plan. | DA518 | The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status. |
| | 20%-30% deviation from plan. | DA518 | The project will be considered in a red or alert status. |
| | 30% or more deviation from plan. | DA518 | When a project deviates from its CITO-approved project plan by 30% or more it shall be recast. It may go on hold for a time and the project should be recast upon startup. JCIT policy #2 has determined 30% to be the threshold when a project should be stopped. |
| **5.6 – Actual v Planned Resources** | Deficiency gap of 15%-20%. | EAC and WBS | The project manager should be acting with the project sponsor to correct this condition. |
| | Deficiency gap of 20%-25%. | EAC and WBS | There should be a plan to show a compensatory change in resources or a plan to reduce the scope, costs and objectives for the project with approval of the agency head. |
| | Deficiency gap of 25% or more. | EAC and WBS | Third party review should be considered if the impact is reflected in other measures. The project should not be permitted to drift awaiting a compensatory resources plan or a new reduced project scope plan. |
| **5.7 – Risk** | | Risk Report | The impact may be reflected in more than one measure. The risk report should be evaluated as to whether it reasonably reflects the sum of measures and where present, the progress being achieved with mitigation plans. |

Established procedures for changes to project plans should be followed. Changes in a project of more than 10% are not approved in this quarterly reporting process. Any change in planned expenditures for an information technology project that would result in the total authorized cost of the project being increased above the currently authorized cost of such project by more than either $1,000,000 or 10% of such currently authorized cost of such project, whichever is lower or any change in the scope of an information technology project should be presented and reviewed by the chief information technology officer to whom the project was submitted pursuant to KSA 79-7209.

## ACTIVE PROJECTS TOTAL     $159,323,101     $41,975,935

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EXECUTIVE BRANCH** | | | | | | |
| **ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| **ACTIVE-RECAST-NEW** | **KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade II- Infrastructure** | $0 | $1,860,495 | DOA Rate Base | 100% | 12 |
| **ACTIVE-RECAST-NEW** | **Mainframe Tape Modernization – 2008 II - Infrastructure** | $7,104 | $606,465 | DISC Deprc Rate<br>DISC Oper Rate | 97%<br>3% | 14 |
| Active | Statewide Financial Management System | $44,777,322 | $11,606,902 | SGF<br>Financial Mgmt – Off Budget<br>Equip Lease<br>Financial Mgmt – KDOT $ Transfer | 4%<br>83%<br><br>1%<br><br>12% | 16 |
| Completed | Statewide Financial Management System Pre-Implementation Planning/Activities | $1,656,818 | $0 | SGF | 100% | 71 |
| Completed | Strategic Information Management Plan | $300,000 | $0 | DISC Fees | 100% | 73 |
| **ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE** | | | | | | |
| **ACTIVE-CAUTION-NEW** | **Case Management System** | $490,000 | $90,000 | Grant Funding<br>Medicaid<br>Revolving<br>Court Costs | 28%<br>54%<br>18% | 18 |
| **COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| Active | Regional Education & Workforce Access Remote Delivery (REWARD) - Infrastructure | $454,097 | $378,000 | Wagner-Peyser<br>RA Works<br>Workforce Investment Act | 63%<br>10%<br>27% | 20 |
| **CORPORATION COMMISSION, KANSAS** | | | | | | |
| Approved | KCC Project 2010 BPI – Business Process Innovation and Improvement | $888,934 | $225,000 | Public Serv Reg<br>Conserv Fee Fund<br>Transport: Motor Carrier Fees | 65%<br>15%<br><br>20% | 126 |
| **CORRECTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| **Completed-New** | **KDOC Enterprise Architecture Plan** | $480,081 | $0 | SGF<br>Justice, Equality, Human Dignity | 54%<br><br>46% | 75 |
| | **Project Name** | **Project Cost** | **Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost** | **Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost** | **Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End** | **Page** |
| Planned | TOADS/OMIS Replacement | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | SGF<br>Grant Funding | To Be Determined | 134 |
| **EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| **Completed-New** | **Enterprise Data System to Support Decision Making and Reporting** | $2,424,620 | $1,525,188 | SGF | 100% | 77 |

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost | Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End | Page |
| **Planned-New** | **Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation** | $1,833,912 | $1,426,410 | National Institute of Education Sciences – 100% | 7/09 – 6/12 | 136 |
| **EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES BOARD** | | | | | | |
| Completed | Kansas Emergency Medical Information System | $443,152 | $244,500 | EMS Fee Fund<br>KDHE Fed Rural<br>KDOT Fed 408<br>KSIP KS Savings | 54%<br>11%<br>27%<br>8% | 79 |
| **HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| Active | Vital Statistics Integrated Information System Phase III – Electronic Death Registration | $988,483 | $264,000 | Kansas Developmt Fin. Authority<br>SSA Funds | 62%<br><br>38% | 22 |
| Completed | Kansas Electronic Disease Surveillance System (EDSS) | $3,000,000 | $915,000 | Bioterror. Grant Hospital Response and Svc Admin Other | 40%<br>39%<br>21% | 80 |
| | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost | Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End | Page |
| Planned | Laboratory Information Management System | $1,400,000 | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | 7/10 – 6/13 | 139 |
| **HEALTH POLICY AUTHORITY** | | | | | | |
| **ACTIVE–RECAST-NEW** | **Data Analytic Interface II** | $2,256,821 | $4,264,719 | SGF<br>Federal Financial Participation | 34%<br><br>66% | 24 |
| Active | KHPA Document Imaging Project | $419,378 | $235,773 | SGF<br>Federal Financial Participation | 50%<br>50% | 26 |
| | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost | Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End | Page |
| Planned | Eligibility/Enrollment System | $15,000,000 - $20,000,000 | $6,000,000 | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | 140 |
| Planned | Health Information Exchange | $250,000 - $500,000 | $300,000 | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | 141 |
| **HIGHWAY PATROL, KANSAS** | | | | | | |
| Active | Digital Video | $2,717,604 | $328,312 | KHP Oper Fund<br>Interdiction Fund | 92%<br>8% | 28 |
| Active | Kansas Law Enforcement Reporting System - TRCC | $583,303 | $504,795 | SaDIP Grant | 100% | 30 |

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Completed | Acquire & Implement Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window - TRCC | $498,489 | $63,050 | CVIEW Grant | 100% | 82 |
| | **Project Name** | **Project Cost** | **Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost** | **Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost** | **Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End** | **Page** |
| Planned | E-Citation – TRCC and KCJIS | $1,443,400 | $300,000 | TRCC – 100% | 7/07 – 5/10 | 142 |
| **HISTORICAL SOCIETY, KANSAS STATE** | | | | | | |
| **Approved-New** | **Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP)** | $718,436 | $225,000 | SGF<br>INK Grant<br>Pending – NDIPP – Library of Congress | 55%<br>24%<br><br>21% | 127 |
| **INVESTIGATIONS, KANSAS BUREAU OF** | | | | | | |
| Approved | Central Message Switch (CMS) Replacement Project | $605,200 | $247,556 | SGF<br>Fee Fund | 52%<br>48% | 128 |
| | **Project Name** | **Project Cost** | **Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost** | **Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost** | **Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End** | **Page** |
| Planned | Kansas Incident Based Reporting Replacement | $625,000 | $225,000 | To Be Determined | 7/08 – To Be Determined | 143 |
| **JUVENILE JUSTICE AUTHORITY** | | | | | | |
| Approved | Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite | $1,392,044 | $246,584 | SGF | 100% | 129 |
| **LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| **ACTIVE-NEW** | **UIM Build and Deploy** | $18,957,746 | $2,670,000 | Federal Bonds<br>Reed Act | 16%<br>84% | 32 |
| Cancelled | Unemployment Insurance Modernization III | $27,754,871 | $2,670,000 | Federal Bonds<br>Reed Act | 38%<br>62% | 84 |
| **LOTTERY, KANSAS** | | | | | | |
| **ACTIVE-NEW-REPORTING INSUFFICIENT** | **Expanded Gaming Central System** | $23,595 | $0 | Lottery Revenue | 100% | 34 |
| Completed | On Line Gaming, Communications Network and Related Services RFP | $219,485 | $20,245,903 | Lottery Operating Fund | 100% | 87 |
| **PHARMACY, KANSAS BOARD OF** | | | | | | |
| | **Project Name** | **Project Cost** | **Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost** | **Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost** | **Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End** | **Page** |
| **Planned-New** | Kansas Board of Pharmacy Licensing, Inspection & Disciplinary Software | $255,000 - $370,000 | $50,000 | Encumbered Funds<br>Pharmacy Fee Fund | | 6/09 – 6/10 | 144 |

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RACING AND GAMING COMMISSION** | | | | | | |
| Completed | Kansas Expanded Lottery Act (KELA) II | $680,045 | $150,000 | Expanded Lottery Act Racing Fund | 80% 20% | 89 |
| | **Project Name** | **Project Cost** | **Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost** | **Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost** | **Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End** | **Page** |
| Planned | Financial Reporting System | $330,000 | $15,000 | Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Fund – 80% Racing Fund – 20% | 9/08 - 12/08 | 146 |
| Planned | Integrated Regulatory Information System | $250,000 | $110,000 | Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Fund – 80% Racing Fund – 20% | 9/08 - 12/08 | 147 |
| Planned | Kansas Expanded Lottery Act - Casino Infrastructure | $751,000 | $261,000 | Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Fund – 80% Racing Fund – 20% | 4/09 - 12/10 | 148 |
| **RETIREMENT SYSTEM, KANSAS PUBLIC EMPLOYEES** | | | | | | |
| Active | KPERS Plan Design Change Project | $237,300 | $0 | KPERS Budget KPERS Salaries | 96% 4% | 36 |
| Completed | KPERS Disaster Recovery/Hot Site-Infrastructure | $257,517 | $319,275 | KPERS Budget KPERS Salaries | 96% 4% | 91 |
| Completed | KPERS Integrated Technology System | $8,000,000 | $0 | KPERS Fund | 100% | 92 |
| Completed | Platform Consolidation | $1,750,000 | $870,000 | KPERS Budget KPERS Salaries | 95% 5% | 95 |
| Completed | Security Enhancement Project - Infrastructure | $1,068,240 | $600,000 | KPERS Budget KPERS Salaries | 92% 8% | 97 |
| | **Project Name** | **Project Cost** | **Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost** | **Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost** | **Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End** | **Page** |
| Planned | Active Workflow | $775,000 | $30,000 | KPERS Fund | 7/10 - 7/12 | 149 |
| Planned | KITS – Financial Management System Interfaces/Lawson Functionality | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | KPERS Fund | 1/09 - 7/10 | 150 |
| Planned | Sharp Interface | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | KPERS Fund | 1/11 - 1/12 | 151 |
| **REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| Approved | DMV Modernization | $40,155,966 | $5,508,336 | Vehicle Operating Fund To Be Determined | 16% 84% | 130 |
| Active | DMV Modernization – Mobilization/RFP Coordination | $522,465 | $0 | Vehicle Operating Fund | 100% | 38 |

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Active | Drivers License Photo First Model Office | $933,154 | $66,000 | Vehicle Operating Fund Dept of Homeland Security Grant | 1% 99% | 40 |
| Active | PVD Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal Replacement II | $4,766,431 | $1,262,386 | SGF VIPPS CAMA | 24% 76% | 42 |
| Completed | KS Apportioned International Registration System Replacement – Performance and Registration Information System Management (KAIR-PRISM) | $1,276,548 | $555,000 | SGF INK Grant FedMtr Carrier Safety Admin Comm Vehicle Info Syst | 9% 21% 46% 24% | 99 |

| | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost | Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planned | CDL Electronic Knowledge Testing Equipment | $252,459 | $58,272 | Federal Grant From Dept. of Transportation | 12/15/08 – 10/29/09 | 152 |
| Planned | International Fuel Tax Agreement (Replacement) | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | Federal Grant (CVISN Grant) – 100% | 7/09 - 6/10 | 154 |
| Planned | Motor Carrier Central Permit (Replacement) | $1,125,000 | $79,200 | Federal Grant (CVISN Grant) – 100% | 7/09 - 6/10 | 156 |

## SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ACTIVE-CAUTION-NEW** | **Host Access Transformation Services (HATS) - Infrastructure** | $402,148 | $204,000 | SGF Federal HHS Federal FNS CCDF Grant | 56% 34% 6% 4% | 44 |
| Active | Statewide Protection Report Center (PRC) System | $1,064,284 | $133,401 | SGF | 100% | 46 |
| Completed | Automated Medication Dispensing Sys - LSH | $587,628 | $57,912 | SGF Institutional Fund | 17% 83% | 102 |
| Completed | Human Services Management (HSM) Roadmap II | $191,024 | $0 | SGF | 100% | 104 |

| | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost | Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planned | Human Service Management | $98,500,000 | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | 158 |

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF** | | | | | | |
| **Approved-New** | **KDOT Construction Management System Integration w/IBM Expediter Project** | $331,222 | $120,000 | State Highway Fund | 100% | 131 |
| Active | Communication System Inter-operability Program - Infrastructure | $54,186,870 | $12,000,000 | SHF<br>SGF<br>Safety<br>ODP<br>PSIC, AR&R & Other | 22%<br>1%<br>37%<br>10%<br>30% | 48 |
| Active | Comprehensive Program Management System Replacement II | $6,939,517 | $1,445,000 | State Highway Fund - | 100% | 52 |
| Active | Enhanced Priority Formula System (EPFS) | $996,332 | $30,000 | State Highway Fund | 100% | 54 |
| **ACTIVE-NEW** | **KDOT Financial Management System Integration (w/Smart)** | $779,707 | $45,000 | SHF | 100% | 56 |
| Active | TRCC Program Administration Project | $235,400 | $0 | Federal Highway Fund | 100% | 58 |
| Active | Traffic Records System Release 1 Deployment | $920,815 | $650,000 | Natl. Highway Transp. Safety Admin<br>SHF | 91%<br>9% | 60 |
| **ACTIVE-RECAST-NEW/CAUTION-NEW** | **Workflow Conversion Project II** | $1,612,430 | $900,000 | State Highway Fund | 100% | 62 |
| Completed | Crew Card Reporting - IV | $754,865 | $0 | State Highway Fund | 100% | 106 |
| Completed | Right of Way Outdoor Advertising System (OAS) II | $30,000 | $41,058 | State Highway Fund | 100% | 108 |
| Completed | Traffic Record System Development & Implementation Program (TRCC) | $737,000 | $0 | State Highway Fund | 100% | 110 |
| | **Project Name** | **Project Cost** | **Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost** | **Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost** | **Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End** | **Page** |
| Planned | Capital Inventory Management System | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | 7/12 - 6/13 | 159 |
| Planned | Consumable Inventory Management System | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | 7/11 - 6/12 | 160 |
| Planned | Document Management System Replacement | $300,000 - $600,000 | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | 4/10 - 12/10 | 161 |

| Department | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Funding Source for Project Cost | Percentage | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planned | Oversize/Overweight Vehicle Routing & Permitting System | $1,025,000 - $2,100,000 | $600,000 | To Be Determined | 7/11 - 6/12 | 162 |

## REGENTS

## EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Approved | Banner Enrollment Management Suite Implementation Project | $519,874 | $124,864 | SGF<br>Restrictive Fees | 10%<br>90% | 132 |
| Completed | Enterprise Resource Planning System | $7,491,002 | $1,460,709 | General University<br>Title III | 98%<br>2% | 112 |

## KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Completed | Legacy Application System Empowered Replacement III (LASER) | $4,954,894 | $0 | KSU Tuition | 100% | 114 |

## KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Completed | KU Dark Fiber - Infrastructure | $142,108 | $57,840 | SGF | 100% | 116 |
| Completed | KU Expansion of Existing Wireless APs – Infrastructure | $1,779,765 | $0 | SGF | 100% | 117 |
| Completed | PS Financial 9.0 | $432,568 | $112,470 | SGF | 100% | 119 |

## PITTSBURGH STATE UNIVERSITY

| | Project Name | Project Cost | Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost | Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost | Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End | Page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planned | Replacement Integrated Library System | $500,000 - $650,000 | $176,000 | To Be Determined | 11/07 – 3/08 | 163 |

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Active | K-LISS Architecture – Infrastructure | $13,254,387 | $1,650,000 | SGF | 100% | 64 |
| Active | Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III - Infrastructure | $796,408 | $780,687 | Capital Restoration Funds<br>SGF | 80%<br><br>20% | 67 |
| **Completed-New** | **Conversion to Exchange Server 2007 - Infrastructure** | 281,332 | $70,500 | SGF<br>Internal Costs | 75%<br>25% | 121 |

## JUDICIAL BRANCH

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Completed | Full Court Imaging | $818,000 | $30,000 | Judiciary Technology Fund | 100% | 123 |

All new Approved, Recast, Completed and Planned projects for this reporting period are in **BOLD.**
New Active projects for the quarter and projects that result in a Caution, Alert or Recast status for the quarter will be noted in **BOLD** and **ALL CAPS**.
**Project Cost:** Planning, execution and closeout dollars of a project.
**Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost**: Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed.
All new Approved, Active, Recast, Completed, Planned projects occurring after the reporting period are *italicized and noted with an asterisk *.*

# ACTIVE PROJECTS SECTION

Active

Projects in this section have received CITO approval and are in the Execution Phase. Agencies submit quarterly project status reports in accordance with ITEC Policy 2500 r1 – Project Status Reporting and JCIT Policy #2 until the end of the Execution Phase. Projects that trip established thresholds are required to fulfill each course of action outlined in JCIT Policy #2 before the project can move forward.

**PROJECT MONITORING:**

**PRIOR to 1-1-05**
**Plan start date** and **plan end date** were used to monitor status as outlined in JCIT Policy #2.

**AFTER 1-1-05**
The **execution start date** and **execution end date** are used to monitor status as outlined in JCIT Policy #2.

# TERMS

| | |
|---|---|
| Execution Start - | This is the start date on the current CITO approved detailed plan that "triggers" the beginning of the execution phase.  The trigger date is an event (ie. hardware/software purchase or  installation, code development, etc.) identified by the agency.  Execution start is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements. |
| Execution End - | This is the end date on the current CITO approved detailed plan.  The execution end date is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements. |
| Project Cost - | Planning, execution and close out dollars of a project. |
| Estimated 3 Future Years of Operational Cost - | Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed. |
| Execution Project Cost - | Project dollars associated with the internal and external costs of the execution phase. |
| Execution Cost to Date- | Project dollars expended through the reporting end date for the execution phase. |
| Internal Cost - | Includes direct costs, not overhead, of state government staff associated with the execution phase. |
| External Cost - | Project dollars associated with an agency's contracted costs and overhead for the execution phase. |
| Adjusted – | Agency modified schedule and or cost by less than 10%. |
| Funding Source for Project Cost - | This item calls for identification of financing by percentage of funding source. |
| Infrastructure - | These are hardware initiatives and not system development projects. They are the underlying foundation or basic framework of a system or resources. |
| On Hold Until - | A significant event and or change has occurred resulting in the agency head requesting the project be placed in a temporary hold status approved by the CITO. |
| Subproject - | A portion or sub-set of the full project, CITO approvals may be given at the sub-project level as the project progresses. |
| Vendor - | Contractor for the project.  If there is more than one contractor the primary responsibilities are identified. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*　　+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Project Report Assessments
## EXECUTIVE BRANCH

**Active-Recast-New**

### Administration, Department of (DofA)

**KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade II**

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 10/15/07 |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/22/07 |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 6/30/09 |

**Project Cost: $0 (Planning, execution and close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: $1,860,495

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Execution Project Cost: | $0 | **Execution Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $0 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 6/23/09 | Execution End: | 10/30/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Rate Base | 100% | Cisco Systems |

The KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade project replaces existing Nortel switching technology with Cisco switching technology. Cisco Catalyst 6500 switches will be used for Core and Distribution switching. Cisco Catalyst 3750 Edge switches will be used in the premise (or edge) portion of the network. Core switches will be installed in Landon, Eisenhower and the Off-site Data Center (ODC). Two redundant distribution switches will be located in each of the seven campus office buildings as well as the State Capitol. Edge switches will be placed in each of these buildings and in Wide Area Network (WAN) (or off campus) sites managed by DISC. Network routing will be re-configured and inter-building VLANs eliminated. KanWIN Internet access, Wide Area Networking, Wireless Networking etc. will be functionally separated. The transition to Cisco data switching will be done in phases over approximately 18 months. The KanWIN Infrastructure project establishes a single vendor environment for data switching and routing. This simplifies network management and technician training which in turn reduces the time necessary to implement a data Move, Add or Change (MAC). The separation of network functions increases network reliability and promotes efficiency in government networked operations. The infrastructure upgrade also allows early adoption of enhanced services like multi-cast video and digital media. It is required for Unified Communications which is the logical replacement for current communications systems like Plexar, voicemail and Automatic Call Distribution (ACD) systems. **All project costs occurred prior to recast.

| **Planned Overall Cost (cumulative) (7)** | | **Actual expenditures (not cumulative)** |
|---|---|---|
| KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade I | $5,898,456 | $5,898,456 |
| KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade II | $5,898,456 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

**Project Gains**

KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade I – Created a new architecture for the entire KanWin network, installed a new Dense Wave Division Multiplexing network in the Topeka Campus, running concurrent Nortel and Cisco networks while upgrading to new networking technology, installed new Cisco-based network in the Kansas Statehouse, Eisenhower, Docking, Topeka Offsite Datacenter, Landon, and Curtis buildings, converted multiple agencies to new network.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | 🪙 | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade (Continued)

### Project Gains (Continued)

KanWin Infrastructure Upgrade II – Convert one (1) remote site to new Cisco-based network, continue agency migrations to new network, decommission old Nortel-based network, implement multicast network for voice and video applications, continue migration to a full MPLS-based Layer 3 network.

**For the reporting period:** Project was recast on 6/30/09. Project was 65% complete at that time. Delays in the project resulted from passing of project director, other very high priorities including the FMS project and the Wichita Offsite Datacenter. Progress is being made. KDOR has been cut over to the new network and is currently finishing their datacenter. Tax appeals has been cut over this quarter. Insurance department switches have been installed (not cut over yet), Board of Regents in CSOB has been cut over. KDOT Emporia remote site has been cut over with more scheduled.

**Execution**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/30/09** | | |
| **\*\*Execution Cost:** | **$0** | **\*\*Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **6/23/09** | **Execution End:** | **10/30/09** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 11/09 | Estimated End: | 12/09 |

Active-Recast-New

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   ✛   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Administration, Department of (DofA) (Continued)

**Active-Recast-New**

### Mainframe Tape Modernization – 2008 II

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 6/16/08 |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 11/24/08 |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 5/5/09 |
| Project Cost: | $7,104  (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $606,465 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $7,104 | Execution Cost to Date: | $1,544 |
| Internal Cost: | $7,104 | Internal Cost to Date: | $1,544 |
| External Cost: | $0 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 5/26/09 | Execution End: | 9/4/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| DISC Depreciation Reserve | 97% | Sirius Computer Solutions |
| DISC Operating Fund | 3% | |

The Department of Administration, DISC is seeking approval to modernize its current mainframe tape infrastructure. The current infrastructure is over 20 years old and consists of components that are in-efficient when compared to current tape technology.  By modernizing the tape infrastructure DISC can: improve the efficiency and performance of the existing tape environment; reduce the footprint required to support the tape library; significantly reduce the number of physical tapes required to support tape processing; reduce the annual cost for equipment maintenance due to a reduction in components required to support tape processing; and increase the security of the tape infrastructure by adding data encryption capabilities.  This project has been shared with the agencies that utilize mainframe services and they are supportive of the project.

**Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)**            **Actual expenditures (not cumulative)**

| Planned Overall Cost (cumulative) | | Actual expenditures (not cumulative) |
|---|---|---|
| Mainframe Tape Modernization - 2008 I | $639,123 | $631,840 |
| Mainframe Tape Modernization - 2008 II | $639,423 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

**Project Gains**

Mainframe Tape Modernization - 2008 I – Analysis for project, installation planning, installation of equipment.

Mainframe Tape Modernization - 2008 II - Complete migration to new hardware, update disaster recovery plan.

**For the reporting period:**  Project recast was approved on 5/5/09.  Due to scheduling conflicts with the Division of Facilities Management and other high priority electrical work scheduled by DISC, the electrical installation was delayed for approximately six (6) weeks.  There has been no change to project cost.  Data Migration continues from old virtual environment.  All new allocations for virtual tape and Hierarchical Storage Manager (HSM) mounts are occurring in the new subsystem. Currently performing analysis for migrating disaster recovery tape processing. Completed informational update on the data migration with the agencies. The business continuity group is sharing disaster recovery equipment needs with Sungard.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Mainframe Tape Modernization - 2008 II (Continued)**

**Migration and Update D/R**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **5/5/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$7,104** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$1,544** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$7,104** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$1,544** |
| **External Cost:** | **$0** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **5/26/09** | **Execution End:** | **9/4/09** |

Close-Out
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $478 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $478 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 9/09 | Estimated End: | 9/09 |

Active-Recast-New

**Return
to
Index**

| Symbol | Description | Symbol | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ◎ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Administration, Department of (DofA) (Continued)

### Statewide Financial Management System

**Active**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 2/7/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/3/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $44,777,322 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $11,606,902 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $42,908,448 | Execution Cost to Date: | $10,554,561 |
| Internal Cost: | $5,369,646 | Internal Cost to Date: | $1,576,741 |
| External Cost: | $37,538,802 | External Cost to Date: | $8,977,820 |
| Execution Start: | 10/13/08 | Execution End: | 7/7/10 |

Funding Source for Project Cost

| | |
|---|---|
| State General Fund | 4% |
| Financial Management System Development | |
| - Off Budget (Fee Collections) | 83% |
| Equipment Lease/Purchase Program | 1% |
| Financial Management System Development | |
| - On Budget (KDOT $ Transfer) | 12% |

Vendor

Salvaggio, Teal & Assoc. -
  Implementation Management
Accenture – System Integrator
Oracle - Software
SysTest Labs – IV & V

This project consists of all activities necessary to plan, design, develop, test and implement a statewide financial management system for the State of Kansas. The scope of the project is to deploy commercial off-the-shelf enterprise resource planning software that includes the following functionality: General Ledger (including Grant Accounting and Cost Allocation), Accounts Payable, Procurement, Asset Management and Reporting/Data Warehouse. A Needs Assessment project conducted in fall 2006 reported that the current STARS financial management system does not meet a number of state agency business needs, identified multiple agency "shadow" systems that result in duplication of effort and cost, fragmented data, and numerous manual or low value-added processes over what could be achieved through implementation of a modern financial management system. The study found the potential for continued proliferation of these problems and associated costs unless a new centralized system was implemented. The study also found that the benefits exceed the costs of implementation. The existing system is over 16 years old and is not supported by the vendor.  **The agency received CITO approval on 8/25/08 to purchase software early prior to the beginning of the execution phase.  This software will be used to conduct conference room pilots for FMS.  The software was deemed critical in order to move forward with the conference room pilots by 10/08.  The cost of the software was approximately $4.2 million.

**For the reporting period:**  The project completed Subproject I of the execution phase of the project on 5/29/09.  Subproject II detailed project plan was submitted and approved prior to beginning Subproject II work on 5/1/09.  This quarter focused on the functional, technical and enterprise readiness design activities. All deliverables planned for have been received within the quarter and have been accepted by the state. The project completed the majority of the work scheduled to be completed by 6/30/09.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Statewide Financial Management System (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $1,858,874 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $224,775 | | |
| **External Cost: | $1,634,099 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 5/06 | Estimated End: | 10/08 |

**Subproject I - Plan, Analyze, Design - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/3/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$14,334,370** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$7,700,341** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$1,733,817** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$1,096,829** |
| **External Cost:** | **$12,600,553** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$6,603,512** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/13/08** | **Execution End:** | **5/6/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **5/29/09** |

**Subproject II - Build, Test, Deploy**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval** | **5/1/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$28,574,078** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$2,854,220** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$3,635,829** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$479,912** |
| **External Cost:** | **$24,938,249** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$2,374,308** |
| **Execution Start:** | **5/1/09** | **Execution End:** | **7/7/10** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $10,000 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $10,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/1/10 | Estimated End: | 8/10 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Attorney General's Office

**C**

### Case Management System

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 11/24/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 12/29/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $490,000 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $90,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $490,000 | Execution Cost to Date: | $116,065 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $490,000 | External Cost to Date: | $116,065 |
| Execution Start: | 12/30/08 | Execution End: | 5/17/10 |

Funding Source for Project Cost

| | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Grant Funding | 28% | Synaptec Software, Inc. |
| Medicaid Revolving | 54% | |
| Court Costs | 18% | |

This project will implement a Case Management System that will displace a number of individual systems existing across the Office of Attorney General. This implementation will be enterprise wide and will be used by almost all staff members.  It is the goal and objective of this project to implement a consolidated case management system.  Such a system is necessary to achieve proper management and deployment of resources, to better centralize data regarding subjects of interest to the office across all divisions and to provide the basis for better interaction with the public through Web based filings and follow-up on complaints and requests for services.  Discussions amongst the staff lead to the decision that the system selected by the Court of Tax Appeals could both technically and cost effectively address the needs of this office.

**For the reporting period:**   During the reporting period the project completed all user interfaces and is ready for roll out once the data migration is completed.  An issue regarding inconsistent names for the same address was identified during the first attempt at data migration which has delayed the go live launch while we determine the best work around for the conversion of the legacy data.  We anticipate a short delay

**Project Status:**  The project is in Caution status due to a deliverable completion rate of 88% based on the 12/29/08 approved project plan.  Our originally approved project plan called for complete of Group A by 7/31/09 which was dependent on final data migration on 6/29/09.  An earlier test of the data migration process indicated a number of issues that had to be resolved along with program modifications to properly map fields from the legacy database to the new database causing a loss of three weeks to the schedule.  Our risk mitigation strategy would be to extend the schedule rather than incur additional costs, add additional resources or impact quality.  We will proceed with the current plan and activities under a three week delay.  The project is not in jeopardy of going over budget or requiring additional resources.  We also have taken the possibility of unexpected issues surrounding data migration into consideration as we formulate our project plan for Group B implementation.

Active-Caution-New

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |
| * | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

**Attorney General's Office (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
    Estimated Project Cost:               $0
    Estimated Start:                      6/08          Estimated End:                    12/08

**Subproject I - Group A deployment**
    **CITO Approval:**             **12/29/08**
    **Execution Cost:**            **$252,600**          **Execution Cost to Date:   $116,065**
        **Internal Cost:**               **$0**              **Internal Cost to Date:       $0**
        **External Cost:**        **$252,600**              **External Cost to Date:  $116,065**
    **Execution Start:**           **12/30/08**          **Execution End:                7/31/09**
                                                         **Adjusted Execution End:   8/21/09**

**Subproject II - Group B deployment**
    **CITO Approval:   Not Yet Requested**
    **Execution Cost:**            **$237,400**          **Execution Cost to Date:        $0**
        **Internal Cost:**               **$0**              **Internal Cost to Date:        $0**
        **External Cost:**        **$237,400**              **External Cost to Date:        $0**
    **Execution Start:**               **8/3/09**          **Execution End:                5/17/10**
    **Adjusted Execution Start:**  **9/15/09**

Close-Out
    Estimated Project Cost:               $0
    Estimated Start:                      5/10          Estimated End:                    5/10

**Active-Caution-New**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     ✚  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Commerce, Department of

### Regional Education & Workforce Access Remote Delivery (REWARD)

**Active**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 1/30/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $454,097 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $378,000 | |

**I**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $421,981 | Execution Cost to Date: | $136,006 |
| Internal Cost: | $1,577 | Internal Cost to Date: | $25,691 |
| External Cost: | $420,404 | External Cost to Date: | $110,315 |
| Execution Start: | 2/2/09 | Execution End: | 9/25/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Wagner-Peyser (WP) | 63% | SKC Communication Products, Inc. |
| RA Works | 10% | |
| Workforce Investment Act (WIA) | 27% | |

The purpose of this project request is to install nine high-definition videoconferencing units for the purposes of providing training to dislocated workers and employment services for businesses and jobseekers. The sites identified for this project are Chanute, Garden City, Hutchinson, Independence, Kansas City, Leavenworth, Overland Park, Paola and Salina. Off-the-shelf equipment will be purchased, installed and maintained by a vendor on state contract. This project is network independent. Connectivity will be accomplished by the most effective and economically methods possible. A combination of Kan-Ed, Kan-Win and commercial vendor connections will be used. Each videoconferencing component will support four channels simultaneously for multiple accesses without the need for a Multiple Connection Unit (MCU). Two monitors will allow Workforce Center staff to communicate with jobseekers and employers on one screen and clearly see the details of documents on the other screen. A high level of clarity is especially important in a distance-learning environment and when Workforce Center staff are helping jobseekers develop resumes and cover letters. A personal computer will be connected to each videoconferencing unit so KansasWorks.com and other job search techniques and tools can be demonstrated at the same time as a face-to-face conversation is taking place. To accommodate persons with hearing impairments who use sign language, an interpreting service will be provided via the Internet. The interpreter can hear the words being spoken and the deaf person will see the interpreter signing the conversation. The long-term vision and goal for this project is to use high-definition videoconferencing equipment to reach large numbers of jobseekers and employers, particularly in rural areas.

**For the reporting period:** On 3/17/09, the project was on hold pending an evaluation by the JCIT. The project resumed 5/11/09 after the omnibus budget was approved. Commerce may have the opportunity to expand installations in Fiscal Year 2010..

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😀 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Regional Education & Workforce Access Remote Delivery (REWARD) (Continued)**

**Active**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $31,806 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $10,606 | | |
| External Cost: | $21,200 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 1/06 | Estimated End: | 1/09 |

**Selected Workforce Centers and Community Colleges**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **1/30/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$421,981** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$136,006** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$1,577** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$25,691** |
| **External Cost:** | **$420,404** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$110,315** |
| **Execution Start:** | **2/2/09** | **Execution End:** | **9/25/09** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $310 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $310 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 9/09 | Estimated End: | 11/09 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Health and Environment, Department of (KDHE)

**Vital Statistics Integrated Information System Phase III: Electronic Death Registration System**

*Active*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 2/15/07 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 12/13/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $988,483 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $264,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $988,483 | Execution Cost to Date: | $642,167 |
| Internal Cost: | $99,306 | Internal Cost to Date: | $44,893 |
| External Cost: | $889,177 | External Cost to Date: | $597,274 |
| Execution Start: | 1/2/08 | Execution End: | 6/30/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End | 7/17/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Kansas Development Finance Authority | 62% | ManTech |
| SSA Funds | 38% | |

KDHE's Vital Statistics system is one of the most complex client/server systems in Kansas State Government. The system facilitates storage, management, and retrieval of more than 8 million records, adding approximately 100,000 new records annually. Over 370,000 certified copies of vital records are issued annually. Business motivators include (but are not limited to); further automation of manual and automated processes to provide a direct interactive verification of death information with the Social Security Administration (SSA), receipt of fact of death information by KDHE and direct forwarding to SSA within 24 hours of death occurrence. The most significant enhancements are to provide the development and utilization of electronic signatures for the Physicians and Coroners and the fact that while we are receiving the fact of death electronically from many funeral homes with the VSIIS, Phase III will result in all death certificates coming into the office of Vital Records electronically and will include not just fact of death but also cause/underlying causes and manner of death.

**For the reporting period:** EDR was scheduled for implementation on 6/29/09. The EDR system's implementation date was rescheduled to 7/13/09 due to issues identified with the filing process. KDHE chose to move the implementation date to ensure users a fully operational system. No additional costs will be incurred as the contract is paid on deliverables. *The project is complete.*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⌾ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*       + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Health and Environment, Kansas Department of (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 2/06 | Estimated End: | 12/07 |

**Phase III, EDR - *COMPLETED***

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **12/13/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$988,483** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$642,167** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$99,306** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$44,893** |
| **External Cost:** | **$889,177** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$597,274** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/2/08** | **Execution End:** | **6/30/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **7/17/09** |

Close-Out **- *COMPLETED***

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/09 | Estimated End: | 12/09 |

**Active**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Health Policy Authority (KHPA)

### Data Analytic Interface II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 10/12/06 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 6/5/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 9/4/08 | |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 6/11/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $2,256,821 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $4,264,719 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $2,256,821 | Execution Cost to Date: | $135,701 |
| Internal Cost: | $491,545 | Internal Cost to Date: | $3,835 |
| External Cost: | $1,765,276 | External Cost to Date: | $131,866 |
| Execution Start: | 6/15/09 | Execution End: | 5/18/10 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 34% | Thomson-Reuter |
| Federal Financial Participation | 66% | |

The statute creating the Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA) charges the Authority to provide data to a variety of stakeholders concerning utilization and cost of health care services purchased by the State and by other public and private entities. These data will enable stakeholders to participate with KHPA in developing a coordinated statewide health policy agenda. In addition, KHPA must make decisions about the management of health care benefits for Medicaid/ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) beneficiaries and for state employees, while balancing access, cost and quality. Therefore, KHPA is planning to develop a data warehouse which will be called Data Analytical Interface (DAI). KHPA will make the data easily available to partner State agencies such as the Kansas Insurance Dept. and the Kansas Dept. of Health and Environment and to other health policy researchers. This is a complex project with four separate entities covering the costs. The formulas are complicated.

- 70% of the Data Analytic Interface will be covered by Medicaid. KHPA has approval to apply 90% matching Federal Funds to the Medicaid (70%) portion of the system development costs. After that we have approval to apply 75% Federal Funding Participation (FFP) to the licensing and ongoing costs of the Medicaid portion (70%) of the system.
- SCHIP will cover 5% of the DAI costs and 72% FFP will apply to this portion.
- Kansas Health Insurance Information System (KHIIS) will cover 5% of the DAI costs using 100% SGF.
- State Employees Health Benefit Program (SEHPB) will cover 20% of the DAI costs using 100% SGF.

| **Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)** | | **Actual expenditures (not cumulative)** |
|---|---|---|
| Data Analytic Interface I | $2,343,232 | $1,238,924 |
| Data Analytic Interface II | $3,495,745 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

**Project Gains**

Data Analytic Interface I – Requirements reviewed, data model finalized and data normalized.

Data Analytic Interface II – Training, user acceptance testing, and system acceptance.

**For the reporting period:** Project was recast on 6/11/09. Efforts to complete data modeling were delayed due to more extensive detailed research during design than originally planned. In addition, receipt of data from the fiscal agent has taken longer than anticipated. Decision points were added to the project to allow for aggressive changes to occur, allowing for a faster implementation due to the delays. We are currently on track. The system is being built and tested. User Acceptance Testing will begin at the end of August. The DAI contract was amended to include the following needs as identified through requirement gathering sessions and other project processes;

- Additional time to research requirements during data modeling.
- Change in scope adding State Employee Health Plan (SEHP) source files not identified in the original RFP.
- Addition in scope electing to license Diagnostic Cost Groups (DCGs) for SEHP.
- Addition in scope expanding the Data Analytic Interface (DAI) database from housing five (5) years of data to six (6) years.

Seven months of ongoing operations cost were moved to project cost to address the additional cost without affecting the overall contract cost.

**Active-Recast-New**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I | Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Data Analytic Interface (Continued)

**Active-Recast-New**

**Phase Two**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/11/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$2,256,821** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$135,701** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$491,545** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$3,835** |
| **External Cost:** | **$1,765,276** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$131,866** |
| **Execution Start:** | **6/15/09** | **Execution End:** | **5/18/10** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 5/10 | Estimated End: | 5/10 |

| Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|---|---|---|
| Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⊖ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Health Policy Authority (KHPA)(Continued)

### KHPA Document Imaging Project

**Active**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 6/12/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 9/4/08 | |
| **CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/9/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $419,378 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $235,773 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $404,628 | ***Execution Cost to Date: | $312,340 |
| Internal Cost: | $11,900 | ***Internal Cost to Date: | $16,352 |
| External Cost: | $392,728 | External Cost to Date: | $295,988 |
| Execution Start: | 9/8/08 | Execution End: | 7/31/09 |
| | | **Execution End | 1/8/10 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 50% | Perceptive Software, ImageNow, Policy |
| Federal Financial Participation | 50% | Studies |

Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA) is initiating a centralized uniform document management imaging system that meets the needs of the various departments within the agency. Upon the completion of this project the clearinghouse, workers compensation, presumptive disability, the finance and operations department, and the state employee health plan will all utilize imaging services from a single vendor. Currently fragmented imaging services exist at KHPA. Departments essentially function as individual entities utilizing individual contracts and vendors. One department, Presumptive Disability, does not have imaging services. The goal of this project is to have all KHPA departments utilize a single vendor for imaging services under a single contract. This integration will occur in phases based on need and as departmental contracts with current vendors expire. In order to meet KHPA's needs, the integrated documents imaging system will. Integrate with existing business applications that exist in each department. Allow for future expansion providing users with simple electronic access to documents, records and information streamlining the process of managing documents and information. E-Government: KHPA utilizing unified single imaging system represents an improvement in reducing the administrative complexity of the current "system". A common system will enhance communication and decrease fragmentation and redundancy that exist with multiple vendors and systems. **KHPA extended the contract of their Healthwave Clearinghouse vendor, Maximus until 12/31/09. Maximus currently provides imaging services for KHPA as part of their contract. In order to avoid duplication of imaging services it was elected to not implement imaging services with ImageNow, until the contract with Maximus expired. The contract with ImageNow is a fixed-bid contract and will not cost the State of Kansas additional money. Integration with ImageNow will occur in phases. In house KHPA units such as Presumptive Medical Disability (PMDT) and Finance and Operations will begin to use the new software first. Other units such as the new clearinghouse vendor will get implemented later in the project.

**For the reporting period:** No new work was completed on this project this quarter (4/1/09 to 6/30/09) and no internal or external costs were incurred for this project. KHPA entered into a contract with a new Clearinghouse vendor, Policy Studies, Inc (PSI) on 6/11/09. PSI, KHPA and Image Now started initial work on Phase II of this project on 7/6/09 as planned. ***Costs reported in January-February-March 2009 included Planning costs in error. These costs have been removed to reflect the correct Execution Costs to Date for April-May-June 2009.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KHPA Document Imaging Project (Continued)**

**Active**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $14,750 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $14,750 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 9/07 | Estimated End: | 9/08 |

**Implementation (Finance and Operations, PMDT, HW Clearinghouse)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **9/4/08** | | |
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/9/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$404,628** | ***Execution Cost to Date:** | **$312,340** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$11,900** | ***Internal Cost to Date:** | **$16,352** |
| **External Cost:** | **$392,728** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$295,988** |
| **Execution Start:** | **9/8/08** | **Execution End:** | **7/31/09** |
| | | **\*\*Execution End:** | **1/8/10** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/09 | Estimated End: | 8/09 |
| **Estimated Start: | 1/10 | **Estimated End: | 1/10 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🥐 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Highway Patrol, Kansas (KHP)

**Digital Video**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Approval: | 3/3/08 | | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 9/18/08 | | |
| Project Cost: | $2,717,604 | (Planning, execution and close-out) | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $328,312 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $2,715,492 | Execution Cost to Date: | $1,194,020 |
| Internal Cost: | $4,972 | Internal Cost to Date: | $4,322 |
| External Cost: | $2,710,520 | External Cost to Date: | $1,189,698 |
| Execution Start: | 10/6/08 | Execution End: | 12/17/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| KHP Operating Fund | 92% | Watch Guard Video |
| Interdiction Fund | 8% | |

Video evidence has become an important part of law enforcement and legal defense. Kansas Highway Patrol currently utilizes Video Home System (VHS) video systems to capture in-car video and audio evidence. VHS technology is outdated and the current systems have exceeded the product life cycle. Digital recording provides higher quality audio/video data. Digital Video Disk (DVDs) also require less storage space than VHS tapes and are easily duplicated. DVDs cannot be overwritten, ensuring long-term protection of data, whereas VHS tapes degrade over time and may be overwritten. As the legal community begins to move toward digital video, KHP will need to modernize video capture to comply with industry standards. The digital video project will allow KHP to install up-to-date digital audio/video components in patrol cars statewide by 2010.

**For the reporting period:** KHP has now completed 238 camera installations encompassing troops throughout the state. The 2009 project budget was reduced as part of statewide budget cuts. The legislature increased the project allocation for FY2010 however to offset the shortfall. KHP purchased a few units in FY2009 and will purchase the remaining units after the FY2010 budget is finalized. While this will pose a slight delay in the first quarter 2010 schedule, the installation time required is less than originally forecasted. As a result, KHP will be able to increase the number of installs per day to get back on schedule and meet first quarter deliverables.

**Active**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Highway Patrol (Continued)**

**Active**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
    Estimated Project Cost:    $1,700
      Internal Cost:         $1,700
    Estimated Start:       6/07       Estimated End:     10/08

**Acquire and Install Digital Video**
    **CITO Approval:**      **9/18/08**
    **Execution Cost:**    **$2,715,492**      **Execution Cost to Date: $1,194,020**
    **Internal Cost:**       **$4,972**       **Internal Cost to Date:**   **$4,322**
    **External Cost:**    **$2,710,520**      **External Cost to Date: $1,189,698**
    **Execution Start:**   **10/6/08**       **Execution End:**     **12/17/09**

Close-Out
    Estimated Project Cost:    $412
      Internal Cost:         $412
    Estimated Start:       1/10       Estimated End:      2/10

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Highway Patrol Kansas (KHP)(Continued)

**Active**

**Kansas Law Enforcement Reporting System (KLER) - TRCC**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 8/14/07 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 3/13/08 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 6/5/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 6/9/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $583,303 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $504,795 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $378,234 | Execution Cost to Date: | $174,700 |
| Internal Cost: | $343,234 | Internal Cost to Date: | $174,700 |
| External Cost: | $35,000 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 6/20/08 | Execution End: | 9/8/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Safety Data Improvement Program Grant | 100% | None Reported |

Both Kansas Highway Patrol's Automated Field Reporting System (AFRS) and Kansas Department of Transportation's Electronic Accident Data Collection Reporting (EADCR) system are approaching the end of the product life cycle, necessitating a single replacement application for the capture of law enforcement and traffic data. In coordination with the Traffic Records Coordination Committee (TRCC), Kansas Highway Patrol will develop the Kansas Law Enforcement Reporting (KLER) system. The project will require collaboration with State, county and municipal law enforcement agencies, Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS), Kansas Bureau of Investigation, Kansas Department of Transportation, Kansas Department of Revenue and the TRCC. The KLER application will incorporate over 15 reports used during traffic and accident stops, including KDOT crash forms, KBI incident forms, and KDOR insurance forms. Validation routines will be employed to ensure accuracy of data before transfer to the appropriate state repository. KBI, KDOT and KDOR will maintain the current data repositories until such time as a State Traffic Record repository is completed. The KLER application will be made available at no charge to law enforcement agencies across the State.

**For the Reporting Period**: KHP continued marketing efforts this quarter by demonstrating KLER at the Law Enforcement Information Management (LEIM) conference as well as the Kansas Criminal Justice Conference. KHP was scheduled to present KLER at two additional conferences this quarter however one conference was cancelled and the second elected not to schedule a demo. During this quarter KHP worked with stakeholders to resolve errors in automated validation routines. The issues have been addressed and the new code integrated into KLER. End-to-end testing by both KHP and external agencies has confirmed the validation routines are now functional. KHP intends to begin statewide deployment of KLER in 7/09.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| ⬤ Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ☆ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬤ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Law Enforcement Reporting System (KLER)(Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $186,459 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $166,437 | | |
| External Cost: | $20,022 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 3/07 | Estimated End: | 6/08 |

**Development and Testing**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/9/08** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$378,234** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$174,700** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$343,234** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$174,700** |
| **External Cost:** | **$35,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **6/20/08** | **Execution End:** | **9/8/09** |

Close Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $18,610 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $18,610 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/09 | Estimated End: | 10/09 |

Active

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| ⬤ Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ☆ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Labor, Department of (KDOL)

### UIM Build and Deploy

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 5/12/09 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 6/22/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $18,957,746 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $2,670,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $18,957,746 | Execution Cost to Date: | $215,570 |
|    Internal Cost: | $4,020,734 |    Internal Cost to Date: | $119,409 |
|    External Cost: | $14,937,012 |    External Cost to Date: | $96,161 |
| Execution Start: | 6/29/09 | Execution End: | 10/11/11 |

Funding Source for Project Cost        Vendor

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Federal - Bonds | 16% | Maximus – Project Management |
| Reed Act | 84% | Perficient – FileNet |
| | | AT&T – Genesys |
| | | The Persimmon Group – Design |
| | | Validation and Deployment Planning |

This project is part of the Kansas Department of Labor's effort to modernize their technical and operation model.   The prior Unemployment Insurance Modernization project completed the feasibility study, requirements, design, and part of the build.  Currently, the UI system operates on an IBM mainframe that was developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s in an era when disk space was very expensive and batch processing was the norm.  The system, in its day, was very well designed and efficiently managed data by storing it in a compressed format.  However, this architecture does not support the needs of today's ever-changing UI business and the need for on-line processing.  Our new designed system will be providing feature-rich telephony and web services to meet our customers' needs.  Bringing in the organizational principles of customer relationship management and case management, the new UI system will provide customers with the high quality self-service options they demand.  This project is in alignment with our KDOL strategic plan that drove the design of our "To Be" concept of operations: Customer-Focused Assisted Self Service and Integrated Operations.   This project will be broken into three subprojects focused around iterative deployments.  The first subproject will be focused on the infrastructure of the core technologies deploying the upgraded Siebel, Genesys, and Filenet.  The second subproject will focus on deployment of first priority functionality, data migration, and interfaces.  The last (third) subproject will deploy secondary priority functionality and wrap up the project.

**For the reporting period:**  Approval of the Detailed Project Plan was provided by the CITO on 6/22/09. Execution is just getting underway.  Four vendors have been retained.  "Maximus" resources have been retained to help lead project management efforts; "AT&T" will implement the Genesys (Computer Telephony Integration) workstream; "The Persimmon Group" will play a lead role on the "Design Validation and Deployment Planning" (DVDP) workstream; "Perficient" resources have been engaged on the FileNet implementation / proof of concept workstream, the Siebel version upgrade workstream, and will have a lesser role on the DVDP workstream.  All but Maximus have been retained on a time and material basis.  KDOL project managers are managing the work on three (3) of the four (4) workstreams in Subproject 1.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## UIM Build and Deploy (Continued)

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 |
| Estimated Start: | 4/09 |

Estimated End:        6/09

### Subproject I – Infrastructure Deployment

**CITO Approval:**        **6/22/09**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Execution Cost:** | **$3,791,548** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$215,570** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$804,147** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$119,409** |
| **External Cost:** | **$2,987,401** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$96,161** |
| **Execution Start:** | **6/29/09** | **Execution End:** | **11/19/09** |

### Subproject II – Primary Business Process Build and Deployments

**CITO Approval:  Not Yet Requested**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Execution Cost:** | **$11,374,650** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$2,412,440** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$8,962,210** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **11/19/09** | **Execution End:** | **11/16/10** |

### Subproject III – Secondary Business Process Build and Deployments

**CITO Approval:  Not Yet Requested**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Execution Cost:** | **$3,791,548** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$804,147** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$2,987,401** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **11/1/10** | **Execution End:** | **10/11/11** |

Close-Out

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 |
| Estimated Start: | 10/11 |

Estimated End:        10/11

Active-New

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ | Meeting targeted goals. | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Lottery, Kansas

**Expanded Gaming Central System**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 1/31/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | *Pending* | |
| Project Cost: | $23,595 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $10,460 | Execution Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Internal Cost: | $8,960 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $1,500 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 4/29/08 | Execution End: | 12/14/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Lottery Revenue | 100% | GTech |

This project affects the Kansas Lottery and the managers of the state-owned casinos and the racetracks with electronic gaming machines. The project goals are to provide Lottery security staff with access to alerts and other information about, and provided by, the electronic gaming machines and to provide Lottery accounting staff with information needed for balancing totals. This project is mandated and required by Senate Bill 66, the Kansas Expanded Lottery Act.

**For the Reporting Period**: This project is in Reporting Insufficient status as a result of missing CITO reporting requirements. Information submitted indicates an Execution start date of 4/29/08. Lottery did not perceive that prior to the most recent timeline received from the vendor that the project had progressed to the "implementation" stage. The entire expanded gaming project has been a stop and go affair. Original planning was for the pari-mutuel racetracks to be the first gaming operations up and going which would have necessitated a very quick installation of the statutorily required central system. With this not occurring the immediate need for a speedy implementation of the central system was stifled. Additionally, with one potential casino manager it was determined that the central system would not be needed until later this year. Lottery assures every intention and desire to adhere to the law and any failure on their part was unintentional. A CITO review of the contract casino system expectations was completed on 3/24/08. The project is currently in system testing. *A Detailed Project Plan for CITO review and approval was submitted on 7/30/09.Based upon information received, the project appears to be in good health.*

**Active-New-Reporting Insufficient**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| ● | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ☆ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊖ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Lottery, Kansas (Continued)

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $12,495 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $7,895 | | |
| External Cost: | $4,600 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/07 | Estimated End: | 1/08 |

**Central System**
**CITO Approval:**              ***Pending***

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Execution Cost:** | **$10,460** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$8,960** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$1,500** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **4/29/08** | **Execution End:** | **12/14/09** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $640 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $640 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 12/09 | Estimated End: | 12/09 |

**Active-New-Reporting Insufficient**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    ✛   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Page 35                                                           Published:  August 2009

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS)

**Active**

**KPERS Plan Design Change Project**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/2/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $237,300 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $235,500 | Execution Cost to Date: | $237,300 |
| Internal Cost: | $7,500 | Internal Cost to Date: | $9,300 |
| External Cost: | $228,000 | External Cost to Date: | $228,000 |
| Execution Start: | 10/6/08 | Execution End: | 7/1/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| KPERS Fund (Budget Cost) | 96% | Sagitec Solutions, Inc. |
| KPERS Fund (Salaries) | 4% | |

The Kansas Public Employees Retirement System (KPERS) administers three statewide retirement systems for the states public employees: KPERS; KP&F; and Kansas Retirement System for Judges. The systems total assets are approximately $13 billion, making it one of the 200 largest pension funds in the world. KPERS membership has increased 10 fold and now serves approximately 240,000 members. Nearly 1,500 employers participate in KPERS, including the state, all counties, all school districts, and numerous cities, public libraries, hospitals and other governmental units. KPERS relies on the pension administration system that it has been incrementally implementing since 2005.  This state of the art system has maximum flexibility, automates business functions, maintains reliable information, and provides instant and convenient access to information by KPERS staff, employers, and members. The 2008 Legislature approved a KPERS Plan design change to be effective July 1, 2009. This project will make the necessary modifications to KPERS' Pension Administration System to fully integrate the administration of the new retirement plan into KPERS Integrated Technology System (KITS) and maintain the benefits achieved by the KITS Project.

**For the reporting period:**  The Plan Design Change project was started on 10/6/08.  The project completed on schedule and within budget.  *The project is complete.*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |
| * | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

**KPERS Plan Design Change Project (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $1,500 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $1,500 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/08 | Estimated End: | 10/08 |

**Develop and Test - *COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/2/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$235,500** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$237,300** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$7,500** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$9,300** |
| **External Cost:** | **$228,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$228,000** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/6/08** | **Execution End:** | **7/1/09** |

Close-Out **- *COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $300 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $300 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 6/09 | Estimated End: | 7/09 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Department of (KDOR)

### DMV Modernization – Mobilization/RFP Coordination

**Active**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 6/12/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $522,465 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| **Adjusted Project Cost | $534,758 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $518,578 | Execution Cost to Date: | $527,691 |
| **Adjusted Execution Project Cost: | $531,225 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $82,013 | Internal Cost to Date: | $104,092 |
| **Adjusted Internal Cost: | $107,626 | | |
| External Cost: | $436,565 | External Cost to Date: | $423,599 |
| **Adjusted External Cost: | $423,599 | | |
| Execution Start: | 7/1/08 | Execution End: | 6/30/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/2/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Vehicle Operating Fund | 100% | Salvaggio, Teal and Associates |

The Kansas Department of Revenue completed a Feasibility Study in May of 2007 to replace the DMV – Vehicle Information Processing System (VIPS), Kansas Driver License System (KDLS) and Kansas Vehicle Inventory System (KVIS) systems. Additionally, an Organizational Design was completed in October of 2007. The Organizational Design was completed in order to understand the planned alignment for the DMV staff and how the structure of business units may be changed to support the new systems when replaced. The DMV provides titling and registration functions; driver licensing and control functions; and inventory functions. The current systems that provide these functions are scheduled for replacement and funding has been secured through HB 2542. The Department of Revenue is requesting professional services to assist with initial project mobilization activities through the contract award and implementation phase preparation. **An increase in project cost is related to adding a full time administrative staff member to the project team in addition to accounting for the time required for the steering committee member participation in the requirements development sessions.

**For the reporting period:** The DMV Project Team (Evaluation Committee, Key Stakeholders and Business Owners) attended the Software Demonstration and the Oral Presentations on 4/6 – 4/10 at the YWCA. On 4/20/09, 3M was instructed to amend their proposal and pricing based on a set of tailored questions and instructions. The 3M Revised offer was received 5/11/09 and reviewed by the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee made their final recommendation to the PNC on 5/22/09 and subsequently the request for a final revised offer was issued. The Final Revised Offer from 3M was received on 5/29/09 The PNC along with DMV Modernization Project team conducted contract negotiations the week of 6/22/09. An official letter of intent was issued on 6/26/09 and the final contract was signed 7/1/09. *The project is complete.*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |
| ***** | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | **+** | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

**DMV Modernization – Mobilization/RFP Coordination (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $3,677 | | |
| **Adjusted Estimated Project Cost: | $2,800 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $3,677 | | |
| **Adjusted Internal Cost: | $2,800 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 6/08 | Estimated End: | 6/08 |

**Project Mobilization/RFP Coordination - *COMPLETED***

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/12/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$518,578** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$527,691** |
| **\*\*Adjusted Execution Cost:** | **$531,225** | | |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$82,013** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$104,092** |
| **\*\*Adjusted Internal Cost:** | **$107,626** | | |
| **External Cost:** | **$436,565** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$423,599** |
| **\*\*Adjusted External Cost:** | **$423,599** | | |
| **Execution Start:** | **7/1/08** | **Execution End:** | **6/30/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **7/2/09** |

Close-Out - ***COMPLETED***

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $210 | | |
| Adjusted Project Cost: | $733 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $210 | | |
| Adjusted Project Cost: | $733 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 6/09 | Estimated End: | 6/09 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 7/09 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 7/09 |

**Return to Index**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🏉 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Department of (KDOR) (Continued)

### Drivers License Photo First Model Office

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 11/24/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 1/9/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $933,154 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $66,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $916,298 | Execution Cost to Date: | $103,911 |
| Internal Cost: | $51,347 | Internal Cost to Date: | $3,911 |
| External Cost: | $864,951 | External Cost to Date: | $100,000 |
| Execution Start: | 2/2/09 | Execution End: | 2/9/10 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 2/15/10 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Vehicle Operating Fund | 1% | L-1 |
| Dept. of Homeland Security Grant | 99% | |

Kansas' current driver license issuance process uses a photo-last workflow where the applicant's photo is captured at the end of the application process. One of the major objectives of the REAL ID Act is to increase security by capturing the applicant's photo at the beginning of the process when an individual first initiates an application. The Kansas Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is proposing the development and implementation of a secure identification management "model office" based on industry best practices, a photo first workflow design, and REAL ID compliance. This model office will serve as "proof-of-concept" for future DMV offices for both Kansas and other States transitioning to a more secure identification management and will prove that, financially and operationally, many jurisdictions can quickly and efficiently transition their existing workflow to become REAL ID compliant. Kansas intends to work on the Photo First Model Office project with the vendor, L-1. The design and operation of the photo first model office will have some continuity with the product currently in use. Training for associates in the use of a new photo first configuration with some similarity to the existing system will decrease the risk of incurring additional costs related to the training of our examiners. L-1 has the tools to support document recognition and photo first workflow that can be integrated with the current KDOR workflow and information technology processes. The existing software and communications used by L-1 can be consistently transformed to a photo first workflow that supports document recognition and storage with little impact on the current system. This model office project is instrumental in designing the new process that will be rolled out across all Kansas Driver License stations and will set the standard as a model driver license office nationwide. Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR), Division of Motor Vehicles in conjunction with L-1 (formerly Digimarc), has been awarded a Federal grant from U.S. Department of Homeland Security to implement this Photo First Model Office for issuing drivers licenses.

**For the reporting period:** This quarter was spent working with the vendor, L-1, to finalize the design documents that include requirements and specifications. The documents were finalized on 5/20/09 and on 5/29/09, KDOR received grant funds in the amount of $100,000 and paid L-1 for their first deliverable. KDOR also received reimbursement of grant funds in the amount of $18,132 for salary costs incurred in FY2009 for this project. The team has reviewed and made adjustments to the Applicant Data Verification and will be finalizing this document during the next quarter. While working on this document, L-1 has ordered the necessary equipment to place in the model office as well as developing the software. During this next quarter the team will be finalizing the applicant data verification gateway document and L-1 will be performing software development tasks for the greeter and examiner workstation as well as the image server. Once this is completed, the next step will be installation of the equipment in the pilot office.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Drivers License Photo First Model Office (Continued)**

**Active**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $14,221 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $14,221 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/08 | Estimated End: | 1/09 |

**Model Office Project Execution**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **1/9/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$916,298** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$103,911** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$51,347** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$3,911** |
| **External Cost:** | **$864,951** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$100,000** |
| **Execution Start:** | **2/2/09** | **Execution End:** | **2/9/10** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **2/15/10** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $2,635 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,635 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 2/10 | Estimated End: | 3/10 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     ✚  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Department of (KDOR) (Continued)

**PVD Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal Replacement II**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 9/12/06 | |
| Project Cost: | $4,766,431 | (Planning, execution and close out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $1,262,386 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $4,755,313 | Execution Cost to Date: | $3,794,656 |
| Internal Cost: | $1,145,250 | Internal Cost to Date: | $761,875 |
| External Cost: | $3,610,063 | External Cost to Date: | $3,032,781 |
| Execution Start: | 10/7/06 | Execution End: | 9/22/10 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 24% | Tyler Technologies, Inc. |
| VIPS/CAMA Fund | 76% | |

**Active**

K.S.A. 79-1477 (enacted during 1986) placed a duty upon the Secretary of Revenue to establish a statewide, computer-assisted mass appraisal (CAMA) system.  The current system was the first statewide Property Valuation Division (PVD) CAMA system installed in the mid-1980's.  It has undergone several enhancements over the years.  The system is aging and has become increasingly more difficult to support and enhance, particularly in the five mainframe counties where the bulk of the total real property value in Kansas resides.  The original project plan (re-base lined in December 2003) included system requirements, software design, development, implementation of 10 beta counties and all hardware purchased to date for the project. This portion of the project completed in August 2006 at a cost of $3,665,554.  The next phase of this project is to include implementation of the remaining 95 counties and will be implemented by the Department of Revenue.  **KDOR moved the following counties (Ottawa, Lincoln, Riley, Pottawatomie, Doniphan, Leavenworth, Nemaha, Brown and Wyandotte) from Subproject IV into future Subprojects in the current plan..  These counties for various reasons were not at a place in their organizational procedures where they could work with the state to convert to Orion during subproject IV as originally planned.  KDOR is allocating another resource to assist in bringing these counties into Orion with a minimal increase in project hours.  This change does not push out the completion date of the project.

**For the reporting period:**  Subproject VI is 92% complete.  Our department remains under budget constraints and during this last quarter we completed much of our work electronically rather than physically visiting the counties.  With travel restricted, we were not able to deliver Ellis County local servers.  We coordinated with the county and have rescheduled this work to begin at the end of 7/09.  One person retired and his position remains open. McPherson County requested a schedule delay.  To accommodate this change and still complete the subproject on time, we have shortened the duration allocated to survey counties from seven (7) days down to five (5) days.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🥐 | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*       **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**PVD Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal Replacement II (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $5,559 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $5,559 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/06 | Estimated End: | 10/06 |

**\*\*Subproject IV – Orion NE - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **9/12/06** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$1,120,954** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$1,214,088** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$283,533** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$283,532** |
| **External Cost:** | **$837,421** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$930,556** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/7/06** | **Execution End:** | **9/30/07** |

**Subproject V – Orion NW - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/11/07** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$1,204,935** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$1,809,309** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$289,092** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$283,532** |
| **External Cost:** | **$915,843** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$1,525,777** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/1/07** | **Execution End:** | **9/30/08** |

**Subproject VI – Orion SW**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **9/18/08** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$1,214,916** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$771,259** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$289,092** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$194,811** |
| **External Cost:** | **$925,824** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$576,448** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/1/08** | **Execution End:** | **9/30/09** |

**Subproject VII – Orion SE**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **Not Yet Requested** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$1,214,508** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$283,533** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$930,975** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/1/09** | **Execution End:** | **9/22/10** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $5,559 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $5,559 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 9/10 | Estimated End: | 9/10 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)

### Host Access Transformation Services (HATS)

**C**

**I** **+**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 12/29/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 3/5/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $402,148 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $204,000 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $154,400 | Execution Cost to Date: | $40,867 |
|    Internal Cost: | $62,600 |    Internal Cost to Date: | $7,574 |
|    External Cost: | $91,800 |    External Cost to Date: | $33,293 |
| Execution Start: | 3/20/09 | Execution End: | 7/20/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 8/28/09 |

<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>          <u>Vendor</u>

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 56% | IBM |
| Federal HHS | 34% | |
| Federal FNS | 6% | |
| CCDF Block Grant | 4% | |

The HATs infrastructure project will provide for the purchase, installation, services (installation and mentoring), and establishment of the infrastructure to support the Host Access Transformation Services (HATS) software. This software provides our development staff with an easy to use tool that will allow them to transform and extend 3270 terminal applications to the Web, portals, and browsers on mobile devices. This project will establish the environment that will enable the reuse of existing application functionality by other current applications or new applications in less time than traditional development methods. This environment will also support the ability to transform legacy applications to the web, while enhancing the usability by the user through components such as drop down lists, calendars, etc. The development tools established in this project will provide development staff efficiencies, as well as future efficiencies for SRS applications users.

**For the reporting period:** Project hardware and software has been received and installed by internal staff. Negotiations with the HATS configuration vendors have completed. Delays resulting from changes in the project schedule to reduce overall project risk have increased the overall project timeline by five (5) weeks. SRS anticipates no additional overruns as the contract for services is a fixed price deliverables based contract. The vendor is on site and their first deliverable, SRS HATS Administration Documentation, was delivered on time and SRS is currently reviewing for approval.

**Project Status:** The project is in Caution status due to a 20% increase to the critical path based on the 3/5/09 approved project plan. The five (5) week increase to the execution timeline was largely the result of a mutual agreement between the contract vendor and SRS to make a modification to the project schedule that would adjust the timing of two tasks that were originally planned to be performed concurrently and were changed to be accomplished consecutively. This change was made to reduce the potential risks associated with executing the two tasks concurrently since these particular tasks are on the critical path of the project. In addition to minimizing risks, SRS was able to significantly reduce the number of internal resource hours required and the costs associated with them. An overall cost saving was realized on the project due to the previously mentioned reduction in SRS internal resource hours and additional cost savings realized during the actual procurement of equipment. Additional memory was purchased in lieu of ordering complete new PC systems and existing servers were used in lieu of purchasing new ones. The total cost savings were offset by additional costs associated with the increase timeline for vendor services. SRS anticipates no additional overruns.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Host Access Transformation Services (HATS) (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $244,148 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $14,048 | | |
| External Cost: | $230,100 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 12/08 | Estimated End: | 3/09 |

**Installation & Configuration of Software**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **3/5/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$154,400** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$40,867** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$62,600** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$7,574** |
| **External Cost:** | **$91,800** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$33,293** |
| **Execution Start:** | **3/20/09** | **Execution End:** | **7/20/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **8/28/09** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $3,600 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $3,600 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/09 | Estimated End: | 8/09 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 8/09 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 9/09 |

**Active-Caution -New**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)
### Statewide Protection Report Center (PRC) System

**Active**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 10/11/07 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 12/29/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 2/19/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $1,064,284 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Adjusted Project Cost: | $1,064,209 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $133,401 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $865,909 | Execution Cost to Date: | $297,545 |
| Adjusted Execution Project Cost: | $851,909 | | |
|    Internal Cost: | $181,972 | Internal Cost to Date: | $62,601 |
|    External Cost: | $683,937 | External Cost to Date: | $234,944 |
|    Adjusted External Cost: | $669,937 | | |
| Execution Start: | 3/10/09 | Execution End: | 2/22/10 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 3/3/10 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | Harmony Information Systems, Inc. |

This project involves the acquisition and implementation, through a Request for Proposal (RFP), of an application that can meet the current and future needs of two SRS program areas surrounding their Protection Report Center activities. The project will acquire and implement software for the intake, tracking, and management reporting of abuse/neglect referral data for the protection of children and adults across the State of Kansas. This project will standardize and improve the business processes for quality and consistency of services across the state and implement a system to support and enable these new processes. This project will improve the ability to consistently apply program policy and procedure for Children and Family Services and Adult Protective Services program areas statewide.

SRS currently has seven Protection Reporting Centers across the State of Kansas to report suspected adult and child abuse/neglect. These centers are currently functioning with very limited tools and inconsistent business processes. Most of the reports come into the center by phone through Mandated Reporters, such as hospitals or schools and information is recorded in multiple fashions and stored in various locations. The information for child abuse/neglect cases must be manually entered again into another system, leaving room for errors and unnecessary duplication of work. The new application will provide a uniform and consistent manner of data processing and business procedures by which all reported cases of suspected child or adult abuse/neglect will be processed by SRS. The system will interface with the current SRS FACTS system, a tracking and Federal Reporting system for suspected child abuse/neglect to reduce the duplicate data entry.

**For the reporting period:** The project team completed the Joint Application Mapping (JAM) sessions which were held to gather information required to complete the Business Analysis Documentation used to configure the Harmony system. The vendor has compiled and submitted the Business Analysis Documentation for SRS review. During the JAM sessions, it was determined 60 additional licenses would be required for field users and SRS implemented a change request with Harmony to procure those licenses. Development of the Technical Architectural Design resulted in the determination that hardware included in the original project budget would no longer be needed. This resulted in an offset which actually slightly reduced the overall project budget. Initial development of the Training Plan revealed a need to extend the project end date by two weeks. This extension will mitigate the risk of possible winter weather delays which could occur during the six (6) week regional end-user training.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Statewide Protection Report Center (PRC) System (Continued)**

**Active**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $183,291 | | |
| Adjusted Estimated Project Cost: | $195,776 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $92,284 | | |
| Adjusted Internal Cost: | $104,769 | | |
| External Cost: | $91,007 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 5/07 | Estimated End: | 3/09 |

**PRC Statewide System Implementation**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **2/19/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$865,909** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$297,545** |
| **Adjusted Execution Cost:** | **$851,909** | | |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$181,972** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$62,601** |
| **External Cost:** | **$683,937** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$234,944** |
| **Adjusted External Cost:** | **$669,937** | | |
| **Execution Start:** | **3/10/09** | **Execution End:** | **2/22/10** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **3/3/10** |

Close-Out
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $15,084 | | |
| Adjusted Estimated Project Cost: | $16,524 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $1,120 | | |
| Adjusted Internal Cost: | $2,560 | | |
| External Cost: | $13,964 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 2/10 | Estimated End: | 3/10 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 3/10 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)

**Active**

**I**

### Communication System Interoperability Program

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 5/10/05 | |
| **CITO Approval: | 10/26/05 | |
| ***CITO Approval: | 4/3/06 | |
| ******CITO Approval: | 10/9/08 | |
| *******CITO Approval: | 6/22/09 | |
| Project Costs: | $55,476,560 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| ******Project Costs: | $44,135,294 | |
| *******Project Costs: | $54,186,870 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $12,000,000 | |
| | | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $55,410,080 | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $55,476,560 | |
| ****** Execution Project Cost: | $44,135,294 | |
| *******Execution Project Cost: | $54,186,870 | Execution Cost to Date: $39,779,713 |
| Internal Cost: | $410,080 | |
| Internal Cost: | $476,560 | |
| ******Internal Cost: | $439,320 | |
| *******Internal Cost: | $605,520 | Internal Cost to Date: $279,480 |
| External Cost: | $55,000,000 | |
| ******External Cost: | $43,695,974 | |
| *******External Cost: | $53,581,350 | External Cost to Date: $39,500,233 |
| Execution Start: | 6/10/05 | Execution End: 6/30/11 |
| | | Execution End: 6/29/12 |
| | | ******Execution End: 9/30/10 |
| | | ******Execution End: 6/29/12 |

| Funding Source for Project Costs | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Highway Fund | 22% | Subproject 1 & 2 - Motorola |
| State General Fund | 1% | |
| Safety | 37% | |
| Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP) | 10% | |
| Public Safety Interoperable Comm. Grant (PSIC), American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, & Other | 30% | |

The communication system interoperability program will assist KDOT employees, KHP troopers, and other public safety personnel to communicate with each other during critical events on disparate radio systems. The program is to be implemented throughout the state during the next six years. The initial phase of this program will be a proof of concept sub-project to ensure the intended results provide the desired interoperable communications for the different public safety entities within the vicinity of the ten towers in District 4. Upon completion of District 4 and validating the proof of concept, it is the intentions of the Kansas Department of Transportation to move forward with the installation in the remaining KDOT districts as funds become available. **In October 2005, KDOT modified the overall project plan and revised the detailed Subproject I plan to move equipment originally schedule for implementation in a later subproject to Subproject I in an effort to improve the capabilities of the system. However, the modified overall project plan did not affect the overall execution project cost. ***In April, 2006, KDOT modified the overall project plan and revised the detailed Subproject II plan to modify the installation approach to improve system interoperability after discussions by various state officials involved. A seventh subproject was added to allow KDOT to maximize available funding to complete two KDOT districts over a three year period. The revision will allow KDOT to address other customer interests. ****This adjusted execution cost will allow KDOT to increase installation of equipment at nine tower sites to thirteen tower sites during the next fiscal year. This requires $2,000,000 being shifted from FY'09 equipment purchases to FY'07 equipment purchases. No impact to the overall project cost, schedule or scope is expected with the advance construction of these sites. *****The agency reported an increase from $15,800,000 to $17,370,727 to Subproject I costs due to delayed invoices for this subproject. ******As has been reported from the beginning of this project, Subproject V through VII had to wait until funding became available. Funding has become available for these subprojects through a Public Safety

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |
| * | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## Communication System Interoperability Program (Continued)

Interoperable Communication (PSIC) grant. However, the amount of funding is not enough to achieve what was originally planned for these districts. The plans have been tailored to fit the available funding. The overall project plan has been modified as a result of the reduced scope to reflect the changed schedule and budget. The original subprojects V, VI and VII have been retained and will reflect the plan for installing equipment in districts 3, 6 and 2 respectively. *******Two funding sources recently became available to complete the project. A PSIC grant to allow completion of interoperability equipment in Districts 2 & 6 and a American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) grant will allow KDOT to install P25 functionality at specified sites in Districts 2,3 and 6. Completion of these sites results in the modification to the overall project plan with the addition of Subproject VIII and IX.

**For the reporting period:** At the present time, the installation of interoperability antennas, coaxial cable, microwave antennas, and waveguide is being installed on the NW Kansas towers. Ten (10) towers have been completed with the remaining towers in NW Kansas scheduled for antenna installation completion within the next three (3) weeks. Equipment shelters at four (4) sites have been completed with all site work being inspected during the second week of July. All microwave backhaul equipment has been ordered for sites in NW Kansas. In addition, KDOT has taken delivery of 800 MHz interoperability repeaters for the majority of the sites in NW Kansas.

Planning - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 12/04 | Estimated End: | 6/05 |

**Subproject I – District 4 Proof of Concept Project - COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 5/10/05 | | |
| CITO Approval: | 10/26/05 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $17,072,080 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $17,077,680 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $17,481,647 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $17,432,167 | *****Execution Cost to Date: | $17,432,167 |
| Internal Cost: | $72,080 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $77,680 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $61,440 | Internal Cost to Date: | $61,440 |
| External Cost: | $17,000,000 | | |
| External Cost: | $17,403,967 | | |
| External Cost: | $17,370,727 | *****External Cost to Date: | $17,370,727 |
| Execution Start: | 6/10/05 | Execution End: | 6/30/06 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/21/06 |

**Subproject II – Phase II Group-A - COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 4/3/06 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $7,671,480 | | |
| ****Adjusted Execution Cost: | $9,656,960 | Execution Cost to Date: | $9,656,960 |
| Internal Cost: | $66,480 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $51,960 | Internal Cost to Date: | $51,960 |
| External Cost: | $7,605,000 | | |
| ****Adjusted External Cost: | $9,605,000 | External Cost to Date: | $9,605,000 |
| Execution Start: | 2/1/06 | Execution End: | 6/29/07 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Communication System Interoperability Program (Continued)**

**Subproject III – Phase II Group-B - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 7/10/07 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $5,170,480 | Execution Cost to Date: | $5,170,480 |
| Internal Cost: | $66,480 | Internal Cost to Date: | $66,480 |
| External Cost: | $5,104,000 | External Cost to Date: | $5,104,000 |
| Execution Start: | 7/2/07 | Execution End: | 6/30/08 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 7/23/07 | | |

**Subproject IV – Phase II Group-C - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 12/20/07 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $5,357,480 | | |
| ****Adjusted Execution Cost: | $3,310,000 | Execution Cost to Date: | $3,310,000 |
| Internal Cost: | $66,480 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $60,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $60,000 |
| External Cost: | $5,291,000 | | |
| ****Adjusted External Cost: | $3,250,000 | External Cost to Date: | $3,250,000 |
| Execution Start: | 7/1/08 | Execution End: | 6/30/09 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 1/2/08 | Adjusted Execution End: | 12/19/08 |

**Subproject V – (PSIC-District 3)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 10/9/08 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $6,662,513 | | |
| ******Execution Cost: | $3,318,103 | Execution Cost to Date: | $4,210,106 |
| Internal Cost: | $66,480 | Internal Cost to Date: | $39,600 |
| External Cost: | $6,595,033 | | |
| ******External Cost: | $3,251,623 | External Cost to Date: | $4,170,506 |
| Execution Start: | 10/24/08 | Execution End: | 1/8/10 |

**Subproject VI – (PSIC – Districts 2&6, ARRA – Districts 2,3,6)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 6/22/09 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $6,566,480 | | |
| ******Execution Cost: | $4,003,104 | | |
| *******Execution Cost: | $7,699,440 | Execution Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Internal Cost: | $66,480 | | |
| *******Internal Cost: | $199,440 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | 6,500,000 | | |
| ******External Cost: | $3,936,624 | | |
| *******External Cost: | $7,500,000 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 8/4/09 | Execution End: | 7/2/10 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 6/30/09 | Adjusted Execution End: | 9/30/10 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🏉 | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Communication System Interoperability Program (Continued)**

**Active**

**Subproject VII – District 2 P25 Completion**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **Not Yet Requested** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$6,566,480** | | |
| ******Adjusted Execution Cost:** | **$1,244,480** | | |
| *******Execution Cost:** | **$1,013,296** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$66,480** | | |
| *******Internal Cost:** | **$13,296** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$6,500,000** | | |
| ******Adjusted External Cost:** | **$1,178,000** | | |
| *******External Cost:** | **$1,000,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **9/7/09** | **Execution End:** | **9/30/10** |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | **7/1/10** | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **6/30/11** |

**Subproject VIII – District 3 P25 Completion**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **Not Yet Requested** | | |
| *******Execution Cost:** | **$4,053,184** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| *******Internal Cost:** | **$53,184** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| *******External Cost:** | **$4,000,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **7/1/10** | **Execution End:** | **6/30/12** |

**Subproject IX – District 6 P25 Completion**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **Not Yet Requested** | | |
| *******Execution Cost:** | **$2,533,240** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| *******Internal Cost:** | **$33,240** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| *******External Cost:** | **$2,500,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **7/5/11** | **Execution End:** | **6/29/12** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 12/10 | Estimated End: | 12/10 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 7/12 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 10/12 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)
### Comprehensive Program Management System Replacement II (CPMS)

<div style="float:right">**Active**</div>

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 12/29/06 | | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 3/19/07 | | |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 10/11/07 | | |
| Project Costs: | $6,939,517 | (Planning, execution and closeout) | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $1,445,000 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $6,939,517 | Execution Cost to Date: | $3,589,328 |
| Internal Cost: | $828,844 | Internal Cost to Date: | $616,046 |
| External Cost: | $6,110,673 | External Cost to Date: | $2,973,282 |
| Execution Start: | 10/8/07 | Execution End: | 9/25/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 10/16/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Highway Fund | 100% | Electronic Data Systems - EDS |

The Comprehensive Program Management System (CPMS) is a mission-critical system used by the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) to manage the work required to support the State's Transportation Network. KDOT uses CPMS to provide program, project, production, and fund management for the Agency's Transportation Program and for maintenance of the network. This system has aged with respect to its technical architecture, programming language and system support availability. Additionally, business processes and reporting needs have changed since it was implemented in 1992. All of these factors cause this system to be functionally obsolete. The CPMS system needs to be upgraded to replace obsolete technological advances and efficiencies, improve the user interface, address analysis and ad-hoc reporting needs, incorporate additional functionality and align the system with current business processes.

| Planned Overall Cost (cumulative) | | Actual expenditures (not cumulative) |
|---|---|---|
| CPMS I | $9,284,619 | $1,324,585 |
| CPMS II | $8,707,911 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

**Project Gains**

CPMS I – Architectural review and Feasibility Study of the existing system to determine whether to enhance or replace CPMS.
CPMS II – Project to replace the existing CPMS system.

**For the reporting period:** Subproject III has been completed. The testing took longer than expected due to the complexity with testing the project cost distribution to projects and integration to the Federal Highway's system. Subproject IV is currently in testing. Subproject IV will run longer than originally estimated because of the report design and development. Designing of the reports to meet the user's needs has required more iterations for reviewing and prototyping the reports than expected and modifications to the data warehouse to include WinCPMS data was pushed back making the data available to the reports writers later in the project. As a result, we have implemented the risk mitigation plan for reports so that the overall project schedule will not be delayed. However, the delay does move the end date for subproject IV from 6/3/09 to 10/21/09. The application portion of subproject IV will still be completed in accordance with the original schedule however report development will overlap with the implementation subproject. Current plans are still to implement the entire system during the Labor Day weekend 2009. There is no impact to the project budget. Sub-project V is just beginning however it is making good progress towards completion. User training has been scheduled and deployment plans are underway. The system is scheduled for implementation over Labor Day 2009.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Comprehensive Program Management System Replacement II (CPMS) (Continued)

### Subproject I – Application (Iteration 1) - COMPLETED

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | 10/11/07 | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | $1,485,461 | **Execution Cost to Date:** | $1,299,062 |
| **Internal Cost:** | $171,979 | **Internal Cost to Date:** | $161,130 |
| **External Cost:** | $1,313,482 | **External Cost to Date:** | $1,137,932 |
| **Execution Start:** | 10/8/07 | **Execution End:** | 4/3/08 |

### Subproject II – Application (Iteration 2) - COMPLETED

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | 1/31/08 | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | $1,088,001 | **Execution Cost to Date:** | $1,020,185 |
| **Internal Cost:** | $171,979 | **Internal Cost to Date:** | $214,677 |
| **External Cost:** | $916,022 | **External Cost to Date:** | $805,508 |
| **Execution Start:** | 2/15/08 | **Execution End:** | 9/8/08 |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | 1/31/08 | **Adjusted Execution End:** | 9/23/08 |

### Subproject III – Application (Iteration 3) - COMPLETED

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | 8/22/08 | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | $1,137,754 | **Execution Cost to Date:** | $1,208,781 |
| **Internal Cost:** | $167,202 | **Internal Cost to Date:** | $208,046 |
| **External Cost:** | $970,552 | **External Cost to Date:** | $1,000,735 |
| **Execution Start:** | 8/18/08 | **Execution End:** | 1/20/09 |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | 8/25/08 | **Adjusted Execution End:** | 5/5/09 |

### Subproject IV – Application (Iteration 4)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | 1/9/09 | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | $1,768,008 | **Execution Cost to Date:** | $61,300 |
| **Internal Cost:** | $183,921 | **Internal Cost to Date:** | $32,193 |
| **External Cost:** | $1,584,087 | **External Cost to Date:** | $29,107 |
| **Execution Start:** | 12/17/08 | **Execution End:** | 6/3/09 |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | 1/12/09 | **Adjusted Execution End:** | 10/21/09 |

### Subproject V – Implementation

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | 6/2/09 | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | $1,460,293 | **Execution Cost to Date:** | $0 |
| **Internal Cost:** | $133,763 | **Internal Cost to Date:** | $0 |
| **External Cost:** | $1,326,530 | **External Cost to Date:** | $0 |
| **Execution Start:** | 5/20/09 | **Execution End:** | 9/25/09 |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | 6/3/09 | **Adjusted Execution End:** | 10/16/09 |

### Close Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 9/09 | Estimated End: | 11/09 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 10/09 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 1/10 |

| Symbol | Description | Symbol | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

### Enhanced Priority Formula System (EPFS)

**Active**

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 9/19/05 |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/31/06 |
| Project Cost: | $996,332 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $30,000 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $722,372 | Execution Cost to Date: | $546,224 |
| Internal Cost: | $30,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $16,730 |
| External Cost: | $692,372 | External Cost to Date: | $529,494 |
| Execution Start: | 12/1/06 | Execution End: | 8/5/09 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 11/6/06 | Adjusted Execution End: | 8/20/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Highway Fund | 100% | URS – Core Application |
| | | EXOR – GIS/Mapping |

The KDOT Priority Formulas select projects for the Major Modification/Priority Bridge Program only.  These are major projects that make up approximately 45 percent of the State Highway Construction Program.  KDOT uses three Priority Formulas to select these projects, including the Interstate Formula, the Non-Interstate Formula, and the Priority Bridge Formula.  The priority formulas are made up of a set of attributes and adjustment factors that help determine how well a roadway or bridge is meeting the objectives of a quality transportation system.  In 1979, the Legislature directed KDOT to develop a method of project selection for major construction projects that: was clearly defined and used documented criteria; was systematic and consistent; was reproducible; and used quantitative and verifiable factors in determining relative priorities.  The current Priority Formula has been in existence since 1984.  It was developed using an early version of Lotus 123 spreadsheet for analysis and Fortran language programs to extract data and make calculations from the mainframe databases.  These architectures have long ago been sunsetted by the State architecture as well as KDOT's architectures.  The time has come to update the current Priority Formula to incorporate current technologies such as the ability to share data, expand the ability for KDOT managers to access the application for "what-if" scenarios, and add mapping (GIS) capabilities to facilitate the visualization and analysis of the input and output of the priority formulas.  The updated formula, referred to as the "Enhanced Priority Formula System (EPFS)," will assist KDOT managers in integrating the current out-dated Priority Formula into the regular business practices of the Department.

**For the Reporting Period:**   This quarter, KDOT staff tested the latest version of the EPFS software that was delivered by the URS contractors and installed by KDOT staff last quarter.  These tests were done on both test and production Oracle Application (OAS) and database servers at KDOT.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Enhanced Priority Formula System (EPFS) (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $264,960 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $17,600 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/05 | Estimated End: | 12/06 |
| | | Adjusted Estimated End: | 11/06 |

**Subproject I – Develop Non-Interstate - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/31/06** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$419,500** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$266,192** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$7,500** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$7,200** |
| **External Cost:** | **$412,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$258,992** |
| **Execution Start:** | **12/1/06** | **Execution End:** | **11/5/07** |
| **Adjusted Execution Start** | **11/6/06** | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **11/19/07** |

**Subproject II – Develop Interstate and Bridge - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/31/07** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$272,872** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$269,502** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$7,500** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$6,350** |
| **External Cost:** | **$265,372** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$263,152** |
| **Execution Start:** | **11/7/07** | **Execution End:** | **1/20/09** |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | **11/21/07** | | |

**Subproject III – Release and Implementation**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **12/29/08** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$30,000** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$10,530** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$15,000** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$3,180** |
| **External Cost:** | **$15,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$7,350** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/21/09** | **Execution End:** | **8/5/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **8/20/09** |

Close Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $9,000 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $5,000 | | |
| External Cost: | $4,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/09 | Estimated End: | 10/09 |
| | | Adjusted Estimated End: | 2/10 |

**Return to Index**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

### KDOT Financial Management System Integration (w/SMART)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 3/24/09 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 6/9/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $779,707 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $45,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $686,898 | Execution Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Internal Cost: | $317,148 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $369,750 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 6/19/09 | Execution End: | 11/3/10 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 6/10/09 | | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Highway Fund | 100% | Accenture |

The State Department of Administration completed a Needs Assessment Study of the financial systems. The results of the study recommended replacement of the current State accounting system (STARS), the purchasing system, consideration of budget system enhancements and the retention of the State payroll system. In addition, new functionality, including asset management (capital inventory), grant/project accounting, cash management and data warehousing were recommended. The Governor's recommendation for FY2008 and FY 2009 support the implementation of a new Financial Management System (FMS). The State FMS (SMART) project is currently in the design phase, which is expected to be completed the end of March 2009. When the design phase is completed, state agencies will have the information they need to begin the detail work on evaluating and modifying their internal systems that will need to interface with the Financial Management System (FMS/SMART). In the Needs Assessment Study, KDOT systems are categorized into systems that will be replaced in the short term and systems that will be interfaced to the new FMS (SMART). There are two (2) systems in the KDOT short term strategy that will be replaced by FMS (SMART). They are the Voucher Entry System (VES) and the Integrated Financial Management System (IFIS). As the State Department of Administration proceeds with its FMS (SMART) replacement project, KDOT will need to integrate several of it's current systems with the FMS (SMART). These systems include CPMS, CMS, City Connecting Links, Crew Card and CCFB to name a few of the main ones. An analysis of the KDOT systems resulted in a recommendation of a staggered approach to replacing KDOT's mainframe applications. The staggered approach utilizes a short term and long term strategy. It is intended to prevent significant disruption to KDOT business processes in the short term, add value to KDOT's system architecture, and limit the time and effort required by KDOT for the current State of Kansas FMS (SMART) project. The long term strategy will involve replacing additional KDOT applications with functionality included in FMS (SMART). The replacement of these applications is optional. The work that can begin immediately will include getting contracts established to begin the analysis of the applications that will need to be interfaced based on information we know at this time. KDOT will be moving from a batch processing environment to a real time environment with several applications. This will be a significant issue with these applications with regard to design and alterations of our processes.

**For the reporting period:** FMS/SMART at KDOT has started the execution phase of the project (6/10/2009). The initial deliverables to the Sunflower project team were the data mapping layouts for both the inbound and outbound data interfaces and were completed and delivered on schedule. The requirements and design of modifications to existing KDOT software applications is nearly completed but a risk of having to redo work due to final decisions on field size and business processes by the Sunflower team not being finalized until 10/09 has been identified. Development on the interfaces with SMART is beginning and requirements determination for data that

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## KDOT Financial Management System Integration (w/SMART) (Continued)

**For the reporting period:** will need to be converted has started. Analysis on the impact to existing KDOT systems required to support the decommissioning of two applications at KDOT is also underway. Although KDOT is dedicated to an on-time completion of all project related tasks and deliverables, the delay in the Sunflower team in meeting their milestones as planned (currently one month behind schedule) may impact KDOT's ability to meet the deadlines set by the state. They have a plan to "catch up" their schedule by adding additional resources and this may mitigate any risk associated with this situation.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $71,860 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $29,360 | | |
| External Cost: | $42,500 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 1/09 | Estimated End: | 8/09 |

**Subproject I - Interface and System Modification**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/9/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$451,088** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$174,838** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$276,250** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **6/19/09** | **Execution End:** | **7/12/10** |
| **Adjusted Execution Start;** | **6/10/09** | | |

**Subproject II - Integration and Acceptance Testing**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/9/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$235,810** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$142,310** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$93,500** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/6/10** | **Execution End:** | **11/3/10** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $20,949 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $8,199 | | |
| External Cost: | $12,750 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/10 | Estimated End: | 1/11 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🬠 | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Active-New

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

### TRCC Program Administration Project

**Active**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:           10/2/08
Project Cost:                          $235,400        (Planning, execution and close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:      $0

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $235,400 | Execution Cost to Date: | $163,980 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $235,400 | External Cost to Date: | $163,980 |
| Execution Start: | 10/27/08 | Execution End: | 9/30/09 |

Funding Source for Project Cost                 Vendor
Federal Highway Administration        100%      Soos Creek Consulting, LLC

A project was defined in the spring of 2007 to identify and coordinate information systems that needed to be modified or developed to achieve more efficient interoperability and sharing of traffic records.  The project was referred to as the Traffic Record System Development and Implementation Program (TRCC).  The goal of the first year effort was to perform preparatory work for the development of a Traffic Record System (TRS) to provide the ability to gather traffic safety information in a timely, accurate and consistent nature.  The scope of that effort is complete.  As mentioned in the planning documents for the TRS Development and Implementation Program (TRCC), this is a multi year effort that will be developed as funding is available.  The coordination is a long term, multi-agency effort, and is an effort that needs to continue.  KDOT enlisted a contractor for this effort.  The Traffic Record System Development and Implementation Program (TRCC) was a CITO approved project that had a Planning Start date of 1/2/07 and a Close-Out End: of 9/30/08.  The project has completed and the contract with the contractor is coming to a close.  Continued coordination of the TRCC program is necessary and KDOT plans to continue to use the services of the contractor.  Therefore, this project is being defined for the coordination effort for the next year (10/08 – 9/09).  It is referred to as the TRCC Program Administration Project.

**For the reporting period:**  This project is targeted at assisting KDOT in their ongoing cross-agency coordination efforts known as the Traffic Records Coordination Committee.  In addition to this program management, the project also includes provision for technical assistance as the first release of the Traffic Records System (TRS) is implemented by another system integrator.  This project is currently progressing as planned and is on schedule.  Soos Creek, the consultant on the project, is assisting KDOT in reviewing the TRS design and development deliverables and providing technical assistance to the agency and its integrator.  In addition to these continuing efforts, during the past reporting period, the Performance Measurement report was updated in order to assist KDOT in preparing the federal 408 grant funding request.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**TRCC Program Administration Project (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/08 | Estimated End: | 10/08 |

**Program Management and Communications**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/2/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$235,400** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$163,980** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$0** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$235,400** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$163,980** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/27/08** | **Execution End:** | **9/30/09** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/09 | Estimated End: | 10/09 |

**Active**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*       +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

### Traffic Records System Release 1 Deployment

**Active**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:　　　　　11/13/08
Project Cost:　　　　　　　　　　　　$920,815　　(Planning, execution and close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:　$650,000

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $796,615 | Execution Cost to Date: | $458,300 |
| Internal Cost: | $80,815 | Internal Cost to Date: | $5,900 |
| External Cost: | $715,800 | External Cost to Date: | $452,400 |
| Execution Start: | 11/24/08 | Execution End: | 7/24/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| National Highway Transportation Safety Admin | 91% | Genesis 10 |
| State Highway Fund | 9% | |

The mission of the Traffic Records System (TRS) effort is to improve the quality of life for the traveling public and increase the level of safety on the roads of the state of Kansas by:
- Supporting law enforcement deployment and enforcement emphasis planning;
- Identifying and managing high-risk drivers;
- Planning traffic safety initiatives and geometric roadway improvements; and
- Improving medical response delivery through the improved collection and management of traffic records information.

In this initial release of TRS five (5) core functional components will be developed:
- Intranet Web-Site (Portal) to provide state and local agencies access to traffic safety data.
- Web Services (Processing Components) to allow for transmittal and processing of electronic crash reports to the state repository.
- Traffic Safety Index (TRS Index) which will allow for a highly flexible means of searching traffic safety records (initially crash reports).
- Reporting Tool (Analysis and Reporting System) to communicate statistical data to authorized stakeholders.
- KCJIS Interface (Processing Components) to allow Law Enforcement searchable access to the TRS Index.

The project establishes the foundation for future development and implementation of additional capabilities within the TRS. It provides the basic capabilities for records reporting, records maintenance and approval, management reporting and analytical reporting. It works cooperatively with a number of other state projects such as the Kansas Highway Patrol's Kansas Law Enforcement Reporting System – TRCC and the Kansas Bureau of Investigation's Kansas Criminal Justice Information System. Several other frameworks for such a TRS were reviewed, however they were not viable alternatives as in this state the Traffic Records System is a multi-level, multi-agency effort and requires a heavy emphasis on open collaborative technologies such as National Information Exchange Model and web services not offered in other more closed-system frameworks. The state-standard Microsoft.NET framework was therefore selected for the foundation of this project.

**For the reporting period:** KDOT, the lead agency in a cross-agency effort known as the Traffic Records Coordination Committee (TRCC) is spearheading the development of a Traffic Records System (TRS) that will provide state and local agencies the ability to properly assess and plan for the safety of the motoring public. This project is meant to deploy the first release of TRS functionality to prove out the strategic concepts behind the effort and to establish a foundation upon which additional TRS functionality can be deployed in upcoming years. As depicted by the attached project schedule, the project continues to target calendar third quarter 2009 for completion. The system integrator has opted to postpone some of the documentation tasks until later in the project when testing has been completed and knowledge transfer occurs, which deviates some from the initial plans. Execution of the data load was also postponed while further system testing is performed which represents a delay in the current project schedule however we do not anticipate this delayed task will impact the remainder of the project.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| ⬤ | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ★ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*　*Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*　　＋　Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Traffic Records System Release 1 Deployment (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $124,200 | | |
| External Cost: | $124,200 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/08 | Estimated End: | 11/08 |

**Develop and Deploy Release 1**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **11/24/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$796,615** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$458,300** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$80,815** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$5,900** |
| **External Cost:** | **$715,800** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$452,400** |
| **Execution Start:** | **11/24/08** | **Execution End:** | **7/24/09** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/09 | Estimated End: | 8/09 |

**Active**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

### Workflow Conversion Project II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 11/15/07 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Approval: | 8/7/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 8/22/08 | |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 5/12/09 | |
| Project Cost: | $1,612,430 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $900,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $1,609,930 | Execution Cost to Date: | $223,058 |
| Internal Cost: | $252,500 | Internal Cost to Date: | $15,811 |
| External Cost: | $1,357,430 | External Cost to Date: | $207,247 |
| Execution Start: | 5/12/09 | Execution End: | 9/9/10 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Highway Fund | 100% | Stonebridge |

The current workflow software used by the Kansas Department of Transportation is technically obsolete and was no longer supported by the vendor as of December 31, 2006. The project will include the replacement of 38 automated workflows and their associated forms to K2.NET and InfoPath 2007. Additionally, 207 Fill and Print forms will be converted from Formflow 99 to InfoPath 2007 and all administrative support programs will be converted. All products are consistent with the KDOT standard architectural direction of Microsoft products and products integrated with Visual Studio. An RFP will be used to select a K2 partner to convert the existing workflows. The project is included in the current three-year Information Technology Management and Budget Plan (ITMBP). All KDOT employees will be impacted by this change however the goal is to maintain the same business functionality and look and feel of the existing workflows and forms. If this conversion project is not done then there are two alternatives, use the existing system until it breaks and cannot be repaired (there is no vendor support) or to revert to paper-based processing of forms and workflows. The Agency has six overall strategic goals: Program Delivery, Organizational Improvement, External Relationships, Workforce, Technology and Intergovernmental Relations. The electronic forms and workflows support all of these goals. Line of business workflows such as the Project Authorization and Highway Access Permits directly support the program delivery goal. Organizational Improvement and Workforce are supported by providing workflows to improve the efficiency and accuracy of the staff in performing both administrative and line of business processes. External relationships and Intergovernmental Relations are fostered by providing outside organizations including Workers Compensation and KDOT's external collection agency with completed forms automatically. This technology directly increases the efficiency of the Agency by automating critical and routine tasks with workflow processes.

| Planned Overall Cost (cumulative) | | Actual expenditures (not cumulative) |
|---|---|---|
| Workflow Conversion I | $2,272,458 | $867,547 |
| Workflow Conversion II | $2,479,977 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

### Project Gains

Workflow Conversion I – Completed seven workflow conversions. Performed a knowledge transfer session for developers, conducted developer training sessions, established the development environment, initial conversion of fill and print forms, developed electronic signature integration.

Workflow Conversion II – Convert 28 workflows to K2 and InfoPath 2007, convert five miscellaneous support forms, convert the Oracle database to SQL Server and re-write the organizational database support program, integrate code into the fill and print forms, integrate electronic signatures into workflow enabled forms, establish the production environment, modify the custom front-end for production, install the production forms warehouse, implement the system, develop user manuals and conduct user training

Active-Recast-New/Caution-New

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |
| * *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## Workflow Conversion Project II (Continued)

**For the reporting period:**  Project was recast on 5/12/09.  The project has been extended to allow a more realistic duration for internal testing of deliverables.  There is an increase in the internal resource time and some increase in the contractor time which resulted in $207,519 increase in project cost.  We have re-arranged a few workflow conversions to better align them with other projects and to allow additional time to prepare a few for conversion.  The result is that four (4) WPI workflow completion dates have been pushed out and 15 others will be completed early.  The overall project timeline is reduced approximately three (3) weeks as a result of these changes.  The costs remain on target with the estimates.

**Project Status:**  The project is in Caution status due to a deliverable completion rate of 80% based on the 5/12/09 recast project plan.  The Workflow Conversion project involves many workflows that are independent of each other.  The sequence of the workflows was established based upon a prioritization among the agency business units.  Changes have occurred within the business units that have changed the priority some conversions need to be completed.  Thus, some workflow conversions that were scheduled to be worked on later are being worked on earlier which has put completion of one workflow scheduled in June behind schedule.  The overall project schedule and cost are not expected to be impacted. To mitigate any further slip in the schedule of deliverables, more attention will be paid to what the impact will be of any further requests for change in priority from the business units.  The deliverable that was due in 6/23/09 is expected to be complete by 8/1/09  An assessment of the schedule of the remaining workflows in the project will be made to determine if adjustments can be made that will allow the recast deliverable schedule to be met.

### Subproject I - Workflow and Forms Conversion

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **5/12/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$1,546,805** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$223,058** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$189,375** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$15,811** |
| **External Cost:** | **$1,357,430** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$207,247** |
| **Execution Start:** | **5/12/09** | **Execution End:** | **5/12/10** |

### Subproject II - Finalizing Conversion and Implementation

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **5/12/09** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$63,125** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$63,125** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$0** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **5/12/10** | **Execution End:** | **9/9/10** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $2,500 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,500 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/10 | Estimated End: | 11/10 |

Active-Recast-New/Caution-New

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

**Active**

### Legislative

**K-LISS Architecture**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 5/31/05 | |
| Project Costs: | $825,315 | |
| Project Costs: | $3,193,175 | |
| **Project Costs: | $13,254,387 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $1,650,000 | |

**I  +**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $818,365 | Execution Cost to Date: | $4,495,807 |
| Execution Project Cost: | $3,186,225 | | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $11,571,207 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $161,940 | Internal Cost to Date: | $1,052,732 |
| Internal Cost: | $612,990 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,577,972 | | |
| External Cost: | $656,415 | External Cost to Date: | $3,443,075 |
| External Cost: | $2,573,235 | | |
| External Cost: | $8,993,235 | | |
| Execution Start: | 6/6/05 | Execution End: | 12/12/06 |
| Execution Start: | 5/15/07 | Execution End: | 12/31/08 |
| Execution Start: | 1/5/09 | Execution End: | 5/27/11 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | Propylon |

This project involves architecture and design specifications for replacing existing lawmaking (bill drafts and amendments, bill status to include history, statues including Statute index, and session laws), chamber automation (calendars, journals, and voting), and decision support systems (meeting minutes, Legislative Research reports, fiscal/supp notes, Post Audit reports, and related documents).  These are priority systems and must become integrated in order to deliver the level of expected services.  In addition, the present lawmaking system is antiquated and has limited support creating a high risk of failure situation.

**For the reporting period:** Subproject V - All Construction Strategy documents have been delivered and reviewed. Process scenarios are in development for testing in Model Office.  Initial review of Legislative Interface was conducted. Data center environments have been established and code base located in the Statehouse data center.  Issue/Bug tracking system and project document repository established.  Chamber Vote system (IRC) API specification delivered and reviewed.  Acceptance test scripts for Core System under development.  The Core System is under development, on schedule and due to be delivered on 8/16/09.  Subproject VI - Red Hat Linux Enterprise virtualization and MWare virtualization technology were evaluated for the KLISS environment.  VMWare was selected based on ease of use, manageability, security and disaster recovery functionality.  Aggressive vendor negotiations allowed the purchase of VMWare within the project budget constraints.  Advanced data center monitoring using egInnovations applications is currently being implemented.  This will allow legislative staff to monitor all aspects of the data center from network connectivity to application and database transactions.  Full reporting functionality is also provided in this application. Legislative staff is also working with DISC to implement a local instance of eHealth network monitoring in the data center.  These tools will allow staff to identify potential issues early, and provide advanced troubleshooting tools.  The next quarter the project is focused on integration and testing of the infrastructure environments.  Staff training on the new technologies continues.  User Acceptance Testing of the core system will take place in August.  The project is on schedule and on budget.  Project requirements associated with completed tasks have been met.  **Project Costs reported in January-February-March 2009 were reported in error. Execution costs for subprojects V and VI were correct to include cost of planning.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## K-LISS Architecture (Continued)

**Active**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $6,950 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,050 | | |
| External Cost: | $4,900 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 4/05 | Estimated End: | 6/05 |

**Subproject I – Architecture and Design specifications - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 5/31/05 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $562,575 | Execution Cost to Date: | $548,276 |
| Internal Cost: | $104,950 | Internal Cost to Date: | $119,850 |
| External Cost: | $457,625 | External Cost to Date: | $428,426 |
| Execution Start: | 6/6/05 | Execution End: | 9/30/06 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/7/06 |

**Subproject II – Fit Analysis - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 8/8/06 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $217,490 | Execution Cost to Date: | $96,000 |
| Internal Cost: | $43,750 | Internal Cost to Date: | $40,500 |
| External Cost: | $173,740 | External Cost to Date: | $55,500 |
| Execution Start: | 8/11/06 | Execution End: | 12/12/06 |

**Subproject III – Integrated Systems XML Appropriations Functional Requirement - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 9/28/06 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $38,300 | Execution Cost to Date: | $10,250 |
| Internal Cost: | $13,250 | Internal Cost to Date: | $10,250 |
| External Cost: | $25,050 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 10/23/06 | Execution End: | 12/1/06 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 12/22/06 |

**Subproject IV – Detail Design Specifications and Development Data Center - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 5/10/07 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $2,367,860 | Execution Cost to Date: | $1,755,941 |
| Internal Cost: | $451,040 | Internal Cost to Date: | $339,161 |
| External Cost: | $1,916,820 | External Cost to Date: | $1,416,780 |
| Execution Start: | 5/15/07 | Execution End: | 12/31/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 11/24/08 |

**Subproject V  – Software Construction**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 1/7/09 | | |
| **Execution Cost: | $8,908,541 | Execution Cost to Date: | $1,342,204 |
| Internal Cost: | $2,308,541 | Internal Cost to Date: | $504,204 |
| External Cost: | $6,600,000 | External Cost to Date: | $838,000 |
| Execution Start: | 1/5/09 | Execution End: | 5/27/11 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     ✚  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## K-LISS Architecture (Continued)

**Active**

**Subproject VI – Kansas Legislative Information Systems and Services Infrastructure**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | 1/7/09 | | |
| **\*\*Execution Cost:** | $1,152,671 | **Execution Cost to Date:** | $743,136 |
| **Internal Cost:** | $178,671 | **Internal Cost to Date:** | $38,767 |
| **External Cost:** | $974,000 | **External Cost to Date:** | $704,369 |
| **Execution Start:** | 2/17/09 | **Execution End:** | 3/21/11 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| ⬤ Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ☆ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | ⬬ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Legislative (Continued)

### Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/21/05 | |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 3/6/06 | |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 7/18/06 | |
| CITO Approval: | 10/17/06 | |
| Project Cost: | $796,408 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $780,687 | Planning, Execution, Close-out (East and West Wing Only) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $363,750 | Execution Cost to Date: | $821,321** |
| Execution Project Cost: | $376,885 | | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $812,666 | (East and West Wing Only) | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,100 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $21,050 | Internal Cost to Date: | $37,900 |
| External Cost: | $361,650 | | |
| External Cost: | $374,785 | | |
| External Cost: | $791,616 | External Cost to Date: | $783,421 |
| Execution Start: | 11/1/05 | Execution End: | 1/31/06 |
| | | Execution End: | 7/1/06 |
| | | Execution End: | 10/31/06 |
| | | Execution End: | 12/15/06 |
| | | Execution End: | 3/30/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 2/8/08 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Capitol Restoration Funds | 80% | DISC |
| State General Fund | 20% | |

The Capital Restoration Project includes replacing interior switches and wiring for telephone, data, and duress alarm services. The project includes installing RJ 11 jacks for voice services, duress (panic) alarms and RJ 45 jacks for data services. DISC is responsible for installing the wiring and for providing switching technologies for data services. The project includes architecture design, installation, technical support, access to public voice networks, KAN-AN voice, KAN-WIN data network, internet, and network control center services. In addition, the project includes relocating riser cable and relocating floor wiring. Finally, the project involves installing copper riser splices and terminating copper. The project has been recast due to the increase of the project schedule by more than 30%. A recast by the agency or the CITO requires refilling of the project plan for CITO review and approval. The Legislative CITO refiled the project plan and approved the delay after a briefing to the JCIT. **Subproject I East Wing Execution Cost to Date reflects a credit of $67,350 for Nortel Switches which were removed and replaced by Cisco Switches. Subproject II West Wing Execution Cost to Date reflects a credit of $32,722 for Nortel Switches which were removed and replaced by Cisco Switches.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III (Continued)

**Active**

| **Estimated Overall Cost (cumulative)** | **Actual Expenditures (not cumulative)** |

**Estimated Overall Cost (cumulative)**

Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure I
$380,600 (east wing only)

Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure II
$380,600 (east wing only)

Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III
$393,735 (east wing only)
$796,408 (east and west wing only)

**Actual Expenditures (not cumulative)**

$18,350

$1,000

See above Execution Cost to Date

**Project Gains**

Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure I
   East Wing voice and data wiring completed.
   Installation and configure 8600 Nortel distribution switches
   Fiber wiring and move of second switch
Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure II
   Cross connect LSOB core switches
   Fiber backbone
   Interconnection to the fiber ring to allow full redundant backup to the Eisenhower switches for core switch services
      from Landon.
Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III
   Install wiring and termination for 40 East wing panic alarms
   Install grounding posts for two 8600 switches and equipment in the telecommunication distribution switch rooms
   Four power outlets in SW Vault telecom room

**For the Reporting Period:** The West Wing sub-project is complete. Final costs are reported. The project PIER and Lessons Learned activities are pending.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $16,850 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $16,850 | | |
| External Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/1/05 | Estimated End: | 10/31/05 |

**Subproject I –East Wing Voice and Data - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/21/05** | | |
| **CITO Approval:** | **3/6/06** | | |
| **CITO Approval:** | **7/18/06** | | |
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/17/06** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$363,750** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$376,885** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$276,427\*\*** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$2,100** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$18,950** |
| **External Cost:** | **$361,650** | | |
| **External Cost:** | **$374,785** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$257,477** |
| **Execution Start:** | **11/1/05** | **Execution End:** | **1/31/06** |
| | | **Execution End:** | **7/1/06** |
| | | **Execution End:** | **10/31/06** |
| | | **Execution End:** | **12/15/06** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🏉 | Reporting insufficient. |
| **\*** | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III (Continued)

**Active**

**Subproject II – West Wing Voice and Data - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **8/10/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$435,781** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$544,894**\*\* |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$18,950** | **Internal Cost:** | **$18,950** |
| **External Cost:** | **$416,831** | **External Cost:** | **$525,944** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/30/07** | **Execution End:** | **3/30/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **2/8/08** |

**Subproject III – South Wing Voice and Data**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **Not Yet Requested** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **Internal Cost:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **External Cost:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **To Be Determined** | **Execution End:** | **To Be Determined** |

**Subproject IV – North Wing Voice and Data**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **Not Yet Requested** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **Internal Cost:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **External Cost:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **To Be Determined** | **Execution End:** | **To Be Determined** |

**Subproject V – Visitor Center Voice and Data**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **Not Yet Requested** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **Internal Cost:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **To Be Determined** | **External Cost:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **To Be Determined** | **Execution End:** | **To Be Determined** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |
| **\*** | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | ✛ | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

# COMPLETED PROJECTS SECTION

Projects in this section have completed the Execution Phase and the quarterly project status reporting requirement. In accordance with ITEC Policy 2530 Project Management, agencies must maintain procedures for conducting lessons learned on IT projects during the formal closing of a project close-out process and prepare a post implementation evaluation report (PIER). Projects remain in the Completed Projects section until the CITO receives and accepts the PIER.

# TERMS

Execution Start -        This is the start date on the current CITO approved detailed plan that "triggers" the beginning of the execution phase. The trigger date is an event (ie. hardware/software purchase or installation, code development, etc.) identified by the agency. Execution start is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements.

Execution End -          This is the end date on the current CITO approved detailed plan. The execution end date is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements.

Project Cost -           Planning, execution and close out dollars of a project.
Estimated 3 Future
Years of Operational

Cost -                   Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed.

Execution Project Cost -   Project dollars associated with the internal and external costs of the execution phase.

Execution Cost to Date -   Project dollars expended through the reporting end date for the execution phase.

Internal Cost -          Includes direct costs, not overhead, of state government staff associated with the execution phase.

External Cost -          Project dollars associated with an agency's contracted costs and overhead for the execution phase.

Adjusted -               Agency modified schedule and or cost by less than 10%.
Funding Source for

Project Cost -           This item calls for identification of financing by percentage of funding source.

Infrastructure -         These are hardware initiatives and not system development projects. They are the underlying foundation or basic framework of a system or resources.

On Hold Until -          A significant event and or change has occurred resulting in the agency head requesting the project be placed in a temporary hold status approved by the CITO.

PIER -                   Post Implementation Evaluation Report. The PIER documents the history of a project and provides recommendations for other projects of similar size and scope.

Subproject -             A portion or sub-set of the full project, CITO approvals may be given at the sub-project level as the project progresses.

Vendor -                 Contractor for the project. If there is more than one contractor the primary responsibilities are identified.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⬬ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*  ✚  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## EXECUTIVE BRANCH

### Administration, Department of (DofA)

**Statewide Financial Management System Pre-Implementation Planning/Activities**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 8/10/07 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 9/7/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $1,656,818 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | 1,656,818 | Execution Cost to Date: | $1,621,428 |
| Internal Cost: | $100,743 | Internal Cost to Date: | $246,530 |
| External Cost: | $1,556,075 | External Cost to Date: | $1,374,898 |
| Execution Start: | 9/17/07 | Execution End: | 9/30/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 10/3/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | Gartner, Inc, Salvaggio, Teal & Assoc. |

**Completed**

The scope of the project is to implement a COTS statewide financial management system that includes the following functionality: General Ledger (including Grant Accounting and Cost Allocation), Accounts Payable, Procurement, Asset Management, Reporting/Data Warehouse, and to evaluate several options for Budget Development Integration with a possibility of implementing functionality in this area based on what is available in the marketplace. A Needs Assessment project conducted in fall 2006 found that the current STARS financial management system does not meet a number of state agency business needs, identified multiple agency "shadow" systems that result in duplication of effort and cost, fragmented data, and numerous manual or low value-added processes over what could be achieved through implementation of a modern financial management system. The study also found the potential for continued proliferation of these problems and associated costs unless a new centralized system was pursued. The existing system is also over 16 years old, and is no longer supported by the vendor. A cost-benefit analysis was performed as part of needs assessments performed in both 2001 and 2006, and in both cases determined that the long-term benefits exceed the costs of implementation. This DA-518 covers the planning portion of the project which includes a number of tasks that are necessary to prepare the State to begin the execution phase of implementing the software selected by October 2008. Major tasks include risk analysis, organizational readiness assessment, an agency shadow system review, preparation of as is documentation and preparation, bid, and award of software and services contracts necessary for the execution phase to begin. Also, procurement and preparation of office space and associated equipment/furniture will also occur during this phase in order to be ready for occupancy for implementation.

**For the reporting period:** The project has officially ended with the CITO approval of the detailed plan for the Statewide Financial Management System (FMS) Project. The approval was given on 10/3/08. The project has closed out and this will be the final quarterly report.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Statewide Financial Management System Pre-Implementation Planning/Activities (Continued)

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 4/07 | Estimated End: | 9/07 |

**Pre-Implementation - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **9/7/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$1,656,818** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$1,621,428** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$100,743** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$246,530** |
| **External Cost:** | **$1,556,075** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$1,374,898** |
| **Execution Start:** | **9/17/07** | **Execution End:** | **9/30/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **10/3/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/08 | Estimated End: | 10/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Administration, Department of (DofA) (Continued)

**Strategic Information Management Plan**

P

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 5/17/07 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 5/21/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $300,000 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| *PIER Final Project Cost:* | *$232,498* | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $293,000 | *PIER Final Execution Costs:* | *$224,848* |
| Internal Cost: | $43,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $23,150 |
| External Cost: | $250,000 | External Cost to Date: | $201,698 |
| Execution Start: | 5/24/07 | Execution End: | 1/24/08 |
| | | *PIER Received:* | *8/6/09* |

Funding Source for Project Cost          Vendor
DISC Fees            100%       The Beta Group

**Completed**

Development of a Strategic Information Management Plan (SIM Plan) for the State of Kansas.  The SIM Plan is the strategic plan for IT in Kansas.  The goal of the SIM Plan is to support IT aligning itself to state agency and governmental leadership's strategic business initiatives.  The primary focus for the SIM Plan is two to five years, although IT initiatives and directions that fall beyond the five year window are to be incorporated.  The groundwork to integrate the 3-Year IT Management and Budget Plan and the Kansas Information Technology Architecture into the strategic planning process is to be covered in this project along with a mechanism to support score carding of future SIM Plan accomplishments.  The development of the plan should follow a recognized and proven strategic planning methodology.  Outreach to all three branches of state government, the public, county government, city government, and the business community is required  KS75-7203 requires "a strategic information technology management plan for the state". Historically, this document has been known as the Strategic Information Management Plan (SIM Plan). It was created in 1997, and updated in 1999, and 2003. Based on previous refresh cycles, it is time to refresh the SIM Plan. Technology, best practices, and thought leadership in IT has changed since 2003. There is a need for Kansas' IT strategy to reflect these changes. The goal of the Strategic Information Management Plan (SIM-Plan) is to coordinate information technology (IT) development throughout Kansas state government, thereby promoting citizen access, information sharing, and improved government performance. The approach is based on enhancing state-wide leadership for information technology, through coordination and communication, supported by consistent state-wide policies and processes.

**For the reporting period:**  *PIER received with final costs reported.*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |

* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Strategic Information Management Plan (Continued)

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $5,000 | *PIER Final Planning Cost:* | *$5,650* |
| Internal Cost: | $5,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $5,650 |
| Estimated Start: | 12/06 | Estimated End: | 5/07 |

**SIM Plan Development/Outreach - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **5/21/07** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$293,000** | ***PIER Final Execution Costs:*** | ***$224,848*** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$43,000** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$23,150** |
| **External Cost:** | **$250,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$201,698** |
| **Execution Start:** | **5/24/07** | **Execution End:** | **1/24/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $2,000 | *PIER Final Close-Out Cost:* | *$2,000* |
| Internal Cost: | $2,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $2,000 |
| Estimated Start: | 1/08 | Estimated End: | 2/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Corrections, Department of (KDOC)

**KDOC Enterprise Architecture Plan**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 4/24/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 8/28/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $480,081 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $395,861 | Execution Cost to Date: | $400,261 |
| Internal Cost: | $35,461 | Internal Cost to Date: | $59,461 |
| External Cost: | $360,400 | External Cost to Date: | $340,800 |
| Execution Start: | 9/29/08 | Execution End: | 4/17/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 6/1/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 54% | Ummel Group International, Inc. |
| Justice, Equity Human Dignity and Tolerance Foundation (JEHT) | 46% | |

**Completed-New**

The Kansas Legislature's Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) requested the Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC), in their August 2007 meeting, to develop an Enterprise Architecture (EA). The goal of this project is to have the necessary information to greatly increase the chances for a clear vision for their future evolutions of the KDOC technology systems. This EA is to include "process reengineering, conceptual data models, core specification, and technical architecture".

**For the reporting period:** All project deliverables have been completed by UmmelGroup and accepted by KDOC. The project has been closed out successfully with this final quarterly status report, and the PIER report was also submitted on 7/10/09. Among the outcomes from this project was an agency-wide business process analysis, in consideration of internal and external stakeholders, which resulted in the realization of a Strategic 10 Year Roadmap. The roadmap is a "business-first" view of a carefully orchestrated series of modernization initiatives – each traceable to the KDOC agency (and the larger justice and law enforcement community) strategic objectives, mission, and vision. The value of this project was recognized to be much more than the sum of the technical deliverables produced. Through this initiative, KDOC realized an effective venue and process for long-range strategic planning, which will carry forward with strong momentum as modernization efforts commence. People from all levels of the organization were able, for the first time, come together and really understand how their business processes work today and how they best should work in the future. The CITA has directed the project team to carefully package and share documentation related to the approach, methodology, and processes employed for this project, and showcasing of this project has been completed with other state agencies through a series of ITAB and ITEC presentations. Through the success of this project, it's envisioned that a similar, strategic road-mapping process and methodology, be adopted for other state agencies who are contemplating large business and technology modernization initiatives in the future. The extension of time was due to completion and review of the final report along with trying to schedule presentations of the final report and roadmap.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KDOC Enterprise Architecture Plan (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $83,268 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $28,268 | | |
| External Cost: | $55,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 4/08 | Estimated End: | 9/08 |

**KDOC EA Plan - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **8/28/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$395,861** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$400,261** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$35,461** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$59,461** |
| **External Cost:** | **$360,400** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$340,800** |
| **Execution Start:** | **9/29/08** | **Execution End:** | **4/17/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **6/1/09** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $952 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $952 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 4/09 | Estimated End: | 4/09 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 6/09 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 7/09 |

**Completed-New**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*       ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Education, Department of (KSDE)

**Enterprise Data System to Support Decision Making and Reporting**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 3/30/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 12/28/06 | |
| Project Cost: | $2,424,620 | (Planning, execution and close out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $1,525,188 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $2,144,695 | Execution Cost to Date: | $2,105,578 |
| Internal Cost: | $1,509,233 | Internal Cost to Date: | $1,546,048 |
| External Cost: | $635,462 | External Cost to Date: | $559,530 |
| Execution Start: | 1/10/07 | Execution End: | 5/29/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Sources for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | None Reported |

**Completed-New**

Currently, KSDE data is maintained in over 80 separate databases with limited documentation. It is difficult to access and use the data collected by the department because it is not integrated and there are no satisfactory tools to allow access. Staff time is spent inefficiently merging and cleansing data from multiple repositories, or resurveying districts in order to complete state and federal reports, research assignments and program evaluations. Finally, there is no student level statewide longitudinal data linked to other educational data to permit research on numerous important instructional and management areas. Development of the longitudinal Enterprise Date Warehouse will furnish Kansas policymakers with quality data required to make well informed decisions. The Enterprise Data System to Support Decision Making and reporting project includes the development and implementation of an Enterprise Data Warehouse, online Metadata System, and Data Marts to meet the prioritized needs of the Agency. The implementation of an Enterprise Data will improve the utility, accuracy, reliability and timeliness of our data; reduce redundancy within our collections; decrease the reporting burden on our schools and districts; streamline federal reporting; improve stakeholder access to longitudinal data; guide data driven decision making; enable data exchange across institutions within the state, including higher education; protect privacy and confidentiality; and support research.

**For the Reporting Period:** KSDE has completed verifying the Priority three (3) data load into the Enterprise Data Warehouse. KSDE has also completed validating the data marts and has implemented the data marts in production. KSDE has completed the Enterprise Data System (EDS) Subproject III, which is the final subproject of the EDS project. KSDE will conduct and document a Lessons Learned Session and begin developing the Post Implementation Evaluation Report (PIER) that is due to the Executive CITO in 11/09.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Enterprise Data System to Support Decision Making and Reporting (KSDE)(Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $233,966 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $191,960 | | |
| External Cost: | $42,006 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 1/06 | Estimated End: | 1/07 |

**Subproject I – Establish Enterprise Data System - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **12/28/06** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$604,400** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$432,462** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$339,294** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$312,264** |
| **External Cost:** | **$265,106** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$120,198** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/10/07** | **Execution End:** | **6/15/07** |

**Subproject II – Priority 1 Data System Load - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **5/29/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$645,566** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$718,767** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$511,051** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$595,002** |
| **External Cost:** | **$134,515** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$123,765** |
| **Execution Start:** | **6/18/07** | **Execution End:** | **3/17/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **6/17/08** |

**Subproject III – Priority 2 & 3 Data System Load - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **5/19/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$894,729** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$954,349** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$658,888** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$638,782** |
| **External Cost:** | **$235,841** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$315,567** |
| **Execution Start:** | **3/18/08** | **Execution End:** | **5/29/09** |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | **6/18/08** | | |

Close-Out **- COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $45,959 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $44,959 | | |
| External Cost: | $1,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 6/09 | Estimated End: | 11/09 |

*Completed-New* (vertical text, right margin)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Emergency Medical Service Board (KBEMS)

### Kansas Emergency Medical Information System

⭐

P

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 2/19/07 | |
| CITO Revised High-level Plan Approved: | 4/28/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 7/18/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $443,152 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| PIER Final Project Cost: | $443,152 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $244,500 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $317,847 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $317,847 |
| Internal Cost: | $27,080 | Internal Cost to Date: | $27,080 |
| External Cost: | $290,767 | External Cost to Date: | $290,767 |
| Execution Start: | 7/18/08 | Execution End: | 12/22/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 5/21/09 |

Funding Source for Project Cost | Vendor

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| EMS Operating Fund | 54% | ImageTrend |
| KDOT Fed 408 Funds | 11% | |
| KDHE Fed Rural Health Option | 27% | |
| KSIP Kansas Savings Incentive Program | 8% | |

**Completed**

KBEMS is implementing a pre-hospital data collection system in concert with KDHE, KDOT and the 172 ambulance services that serve the State.  The system uses a vendor-hosted off-the-shelf system configured to meet Kansas' needs and the NEMSIS (National EMS Information System) requirements.  KBEMS is assisting the implementation by providing a fully ruggedized laptop and client software to the first 50 services that volunteer to participate in the project. Funding for the project is provided by KBEMS along with grants from KDHE and KDOT.

**For the reporting period:**  PIER received with final costs reported.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $119,305 | PIER Final Planning Costs: | $119,305 |
| Internal Cost: | $43,632 | Internal Cost to Date: | $43,632 |
| External Cost: | $75,673 | External Cost to Date: | $75,673 |
| Estimated Start: | 7/06 | Estimated End: | 7/08 |
| | | Adjusted Estimated End: | 9/08 |

**Implementation - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **7/18/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$317,847** | **PIER Final Execution Costs:** | **$317,847** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$27,080** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$27,080** |
| **External Cost:** | **$290,767** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$290,767** |
| **Execution Start:** | **7/18/08** | **Execution End:** | **12/22/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $6,000 | PIER Final Close-Out Costs: | $6,000 |
| Internal Cost: | $1,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $1,000 |
| External Cost: | 5,000 | External Cost to Date: | $5,000 |
| Estimated Start: | 12/08 | Estimated End: | 12/08 |

**Return to Index**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Health and Environment, Department of (KDHE)

**Kansas Electronic Disease Surveillance System (EDSS)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 1/10/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 9/28/06 | |
| Project Cost: | $3,000,000 | (Planning, execution, and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $915,000 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $2,773,309 | Execution Cost to Date: $1,254,809 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: $0 |
| External Cost: | $2,773,309 | External Cost to Date: $1,254,809 |
| Execution Start: | 10/12/06 | Execution End: 6/30/10 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: 3/31/09 |
| | | PIER Received: |

Funding Source for Project Cost               Vendor
Bioterrorism Grant (CDC)           40%    Scientific Technologies Corp (STC)
Hospital Response and Services Administration 39%
Other potential funding sources      21%
  Immunizations Program Grant (CDC)
  Tuberculosis Control and Prevention Grant (CDC)
  Lead Surveillance Grant (CDC)
  HIV Surveillance Grant (CDC)
  STD Surveillance Grant (CDC)

**Completed**

Kansas has had a secure, web-based, electronic disease surveillance system since 1999. This system allows local health departments to report over 56 different infectious conditions to the state health department in "real-time," providing for timely response and monitoring of diseases impacting the public's health. This custom system was built with funds from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) at a time when no customizable off-the-shelf (COTS) solutions for disease surveillance systems existed. However, over the ensuing six years, many advances have been made, and state-of-the-art COTS systems are now employed in several states, bringing disease surveillance activities into the modern era of computerized healthcare systems. After years of enhancements and fixes to the current system (called HAWK), it became clear that the current system had reached the limits of its functionality, and further enhancements actually became detrimental to the stability of the system. **KDHE will not seek CITO approval of Subproject III and Subproject IV due to budget cuts and reductions in federal funding.

**For the reporting period:** The project has been completed. A PIER Report will be submitted within six (6) months.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🥏 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Kansas Electronic Disease Surveillance System (EDSS) (Continued)

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $226,691 |
| External Cost: | $226,691 |
| Estimated Start: | 1/05 | Estimated End: | 10/06 |

**Subproject I – Core System and Base Requirements - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 9/28/06 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $673,357 | Execution Cost to Date: | $630,156 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $673,357 | External Cost to Date: | $630,156 |
| Execution Start: | 10/12/06 | Execution End: | 6/29/07 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 10/29/07 |

**Subproject II – Primary Priority Requirements - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 5/24/07 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $770,476 | Execution Cost to Date: | $624,653 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $770,476 | External Cost to Date: | $624,653 |
| Execution Start: | 7/2/07 | Execution End: | 6/30/08 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 11/5/07 | Adjusted Execution End: | 3/31/09 |

**\*\*Subproject III – Secondary Requirements – CLOSED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | | |
| Execution Cost: | $790,476 | Execution Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $790,476 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 7/1/08 | Execution End: | 6/30/09 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 1/5/09 | | |

**\*\*Subproject IV – Tertiary and Optional Functionality – CLOSED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | | |
| Execution Cost: | $539,000 | Execution Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $0 | External Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 7/1/09 | Execution End: | 6/30/10 |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 7/10 | Estimated End: | 7/10 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 3/09 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 3/09 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😀 Meeting targeted goals. | | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Highway Patrol, Kansas (KHP)

### Acquire and Implement Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window-TRCC

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 10/19/06 | | | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 3/22/07 | | | |
| Project Cost: | $498,489 | (Planning, execution and closeout) | | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $63,050 | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $446,582 | Execution Cost to Date: | $453,368 |
| Internal Cost: | $103,922 | Internal Cost to Date: | $48,972 |
| External Cost: | $342,660 | External Cost to Date: | $404,396 |
| Execution Start: | 10/26/06 | Execution End: | 3/12/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 6/20/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| CVIEW Grant | 100% | Iteris, Inc. |

**Completed**

The Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window (CVIEW) project will be implemented under the CVISN program in an effort to create an information network using advanced technology that will enhance efficiency, safety, compliance and enforcement for commercial vehicle operations. The Kansas CVIEW will be a state system that collects information from the commercial vehicle (CV) credentialing and tax systems to formulate segments of the interstate carrier, vehicle and (future) driver snapshots and reports for exchange within the state and with the SAFER system. In CVISN Level 1, there is a requirement to implement CVIEW (or a CVIEW equivalent system) for exchange of intrastate and interstate data within the state. The Kansas CVIEW is tentatively identified as the final component to bring the state in Level 1 compliance. Having a CVIEW will allow Kansas to send and receive International Registration Plan (IRP) records with SAFER. This project is a Traffic Record Coordinating Committee project. This project is intended to place CVIEW software and hardware at all WAN connected Troop headquarter locations, district and zone offices, mobile data units (for roadside queries) and seven scale facilities throughout Kansas. CVIEW will provide the core CVISN functionality to allow commercial vehicle enforcement personnel access to applicable databases in the field, including roadside access to, and integration with, PRISM and SAFETYSTAT as well as direct transmission of data to and from SAFER.

**For the Reporting Period**: KHP filed a recovery plan on 4/28/08 to address delays in execution related to the Kansas IRP deployment. KDOR implemented the Kansas IRP system on 6/9 and began transferring files to KHP on 6/16. During the quarter, Kansas received certification to upload Interstate Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA) and International Registration Program (IRP) data to SAFER. Training was completed and the system was released on 6/20. A learning curve is expected as users gain a better understanding of the data elements being presented and the authoritative sources used, however preliminary feedback has been positive. Both SAFER and CVIEW will be issuing new releases in the next quarter. SAFER improvements will address data quality issues in the federal databases. CVIEW enhancements will provide additional reports to support PRISM reporting requirements as well as integrate the SAFER changes.

| | |
|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* ✚ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**TRCC-Acquire and Implement Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $49,206 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $38,541 | | |
| External Cost: | $10,665 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 9/06 | Estimated End: | 4/07 |

**Execution - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **3/22/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$446,582** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$453,368** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$103,922** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$48,972** |
| **External Cost:** | **$342,660** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$404,396** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/26/06** | **Execution End:** | **3/12/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **6/20/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $2,701 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,701 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 3/08 | Estimated End: | 3/08 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 6/08 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 6/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Labor, Department of (KDOL)

### Unemployment Insurance Modernization III

| | |
|---|---|
| **CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 8/19/04 |
| **CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 10/11/05 |
| **CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/27/05 |
| CITO Recast High-Level Plan Approval: | 4/19/07 |
| ***CITO Recast Detailed Plan Approval: | 8/23/07 |
| CITO Recast Detailed Plan Approval: | 3/27/08 |
| Project Cost: | $27,754,871 |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $2,670,000 |

**Cancelled**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $27,739,871 | Execution Cost to Date: | $14,804,134 |
| Internal Cost: | $1,425,881 | Internal Cost to Date: | $1,301,445 |
| External Cost: | $26,313,990 | External Cost to Date: | $13,502,689 |
| Execution Start: | 3/17/08 | Execution End: | 8/14/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Federal – Bonds | 38% | IBM – Lead Developer |
| Reed Act | 62% | MAXIMUS – Indep. Validation & Verification Persimmons Group – Business Req. and Change Management |

The Kansas Department of Labor (KDOL) is committed to modernizing its current Unemployment Insurance (UI) System. During Phase I of the Unemployment Insurance Modernization Project (UIM) there were two concepts from the KDOL strategic plan that drove the design of our "To Be" concept of operations: Customer-Focused Assisted Self Service and Integrated Operations.  Our research and survey results from Phase I indicated that our customers, both employers and employees, are demanding simpler ways to interact with our agency for services.  Using this information a plan was developed for providing feature-rich telephony and web services to meet our customers' needs.  Bringing in the organizational principles of customer relationship management and case management, the new UI system will provide customers with the high quality self-service options they demand.  As part of our ongoing emphasis on integrated operations, we also worked to formulate a new business concept for an agency structured by processes instead of traditional business silos like Benefits, Appeals, Contributions and Integrity.  Reorganizing operations to group similar processes together will enable us to achieve more efficiencies than simply building separate systems for each business silo.  Because we are building integrated, shared systems, we will maximize economies of scale.  This approach will be more cost effective than building the system in a piecemeal fashion.  As a result of the successful completion of Phase I of the UIM Project, KDOL published a Request for Proposal (RFP) seeking proposals to accomplish all the goals outlined in Phase I.  After reviewing the proposals, it is clear that in order to accomplish our goals, we needed to be process-focused in the implementation.  We cannot rewrite the Benefits system first, then Contributions because we are eliminating these old silos. In addition, we have discovered that all the UI systems are interconnected, both technically and in process. To replace one system without upgrading another would be difficult and more costly.  Currently, the UI system operates on an IBM mainframe that was developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s in an era when disk space was very expensive and batch processing was the norm.  The system, in its day, was very well designed and efficiently managed data by storing it in a compressed format.  However, this architecture does not support the needs of today's ever-changing UI business and the need for on-line processing.

**History:** **As a result of the above changes, KDOL received CITO approval of a recast high-level project plan April 19, 2007. The change reflected including all Unemployment Insurance processes; the original scope of this project did not include the Contributions system.  The revised project cost, $41,722,750, was a 50% increase in cost.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Unemployment Insurance Modernization III (Continued)

**History (Continued):**  The estimated completion date, August 2009, would be 26 months from the project execution start date.  Prior to the April 19, 2007 recast, the Kansas Department of Labor reported in the July-August-September 2005 Quarterly Report that they had terminated its contract with the original Phase 1 contractor, BearingPoint, Inc. due to an inability to resolve issues surrounding the project including, but not limited to, the development of an acceptable project plan and project management plan.  KDOL suspended activities, including those of the Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V) contractor, Maximus, Inc. while a replacement vendor was engaged.  KDOL successfully negotiated a contract with IBM, the runner up during original contract negotiations to BearingPoint, Inc. and the project planning phase resumed on September 21, 2005.  KDOL received CITO approval for their revised high-level project plan on October 11, 2005.  KDOL received CITO approval of that detailed project plan on October 27, 2005 and the project got underway.  Cost for these previous efforts was $5,538,408.  ***The CITO approved the UIM II Recast Project Plan on August 23, 2007.  KDOL approved a revised UIM II project schedule on September 13, 2007 based on a change of the methodology for implementation.  This change moved the UIM project from the path of the existing Siebel environment to a "Green Field" approach that will better align with the objectives of the business process reengineering.

**Planned Overall Cost** (cumulative)          **Actual Expenditures** (not cumulative)
UI Modernization I    - $20,965,190          $5,538,408
UI Modernization II   - $41,722,750          $8,429,471
UI Modernization III  - $41,722,750          See above Execution Cost to Date

**Project Gains**
UI Modernization I – Phase I Planning, Execution of Business Process Reengineering, RFP for Phase II Implementation and Early Engagement: Current Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Information Technology (IT) Operations Assessment; Concept of Operations; Alternative Solutions Evaluation; Business and Functional Requirements Documentation; RFP and Implemented Strategy Development; RFP Issuance and Award Phase II Implementation; High Level and Detailed Level Implementation Project Plan.
UI Modernization II – External customers Survey; Internal employee opinion survey; internal communications plan/Sharepoint site development; Functional Requirements; Solution architecture; Technical Requirement; Development and testing technical environments; Developer training; Business use cases to Operational Level Processes Mapping; Work force planning team; Model office for prototyping future processes developed; Movement of all UI benefits files to electronic storage.
UI Modernization III – Subproject I - Detailed Security Implementation Plan; Deployment Plan for Model office pre plan for completed project; GUI Screens prototyped for the Model Office; General Siebel Training; Business Process Materials; System Design; Master Test Scripts; Future Organizational Model; End User Knowledge and Knowledge Transfer Check; Core Competency Training; Future Forms Defined and Mapped.  Subproject II - Rules Engine; testing; Convert and load legacy data; Decommission legacy UI system; Business process training; Implement new organization structures; "Go live" with the new Siebel, Genesys and Filenet environments.

**For the reporting Period:**  The UIM project began this quarter in the hold status as approved on 12/9/08 and discussions continued with the delivery vendor toward resolving the previously identified issues.  In January, the economic downturn resulted in an Unemployment Insurance claims workload that was nearly double the workload from the previous year.  All work being done at KDOL turned to a tactical nature to deal with the surging workloads.  Discussions with the vendor continued and we came to an agreement on the work performed to amicably end our relationship in February.  Though work was halted on the UIM project, we continued to follow the vision and strategy of UIM.  We are leveraging the work completed with IBM and are continue to use the Siebel at the core of our existing system and as the base of our new system.  Our approach into the Build and Deployment of UIM is to decompose the end goal into small pieces (iterations).  This will be comprised of smaller vendor engagements and temporary augmentation of our information technology staffing.  Each iteration will end with deployed technology and supporting organizational change.  This will bring more immediate benefits from components that are built.  This will also enable the agency / us to be more agile in responding to the environmental factors of the economy.  With this move, we are closing the Unemployment Insurance Modernization Project II.  We are currently working with the KITO office regarding the startup of the UIM Build and Deploy Project.  Timeline and Budget information will be submitted to the CITO.  We do not expect to require any additional funding.

**Cancelled**

| | Legend | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| ● | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ★ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Unemployment Insurance Modernization III (Continued)**

**Subproject I – User Interface and Model Sub 1A - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **3/27/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$5,914,871** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$5,440,141** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$490,881** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$228,112** |
| **External Cost:** | **$5,423,990** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$5,212,029** |
| **Execution Start:** | **3/17/08** | **Execution End:** | **10/16/08** |

**Subproject II – Integration and Implementation**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **3/27/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$21,825,000** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$9,363,993** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$935,000** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$1,073,333** |
| **External Cost:** | **$20,890,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$8,290,660** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/17/08** | **Execution End:** | **8/14/09** |

Close-Out

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $15,000 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $15,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/09 | Estimated End: | 8/09 |

**Cancelled**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Lottery, Kansas

**Online Gaming System, Communications Network and Related Services RFP**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 1/7/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 7/26/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $219,485 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $20,245,903 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $139,440 | Execution Cost to Date: | $126,365 |
| Internal Cost: | $139,440 | Internal Cost to Date: | $120,680 |
| External Cost: | $0 | External Cost to Date: | $5,685 |
| Execution Start: | 7/30/07 | Execution End: | 8/3/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/17/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
| Lottery Operating Fund | 100% | GTECH |

**Completed**

The Kansas Lottery currently contracts with GTECH Corporation to provide an Online Gaming System consisting of a central site system, lottery terminals at 1900 retail locations across the state, a satellite and radio network to connect the retail terminals to the central system, and other related equipment and services. The Online Gaming System and related equipment and services consist of one contract. The communications network providing the connectivity between the retail location and the central site consists of a second contract. GTECH is the primary contractor in both instances. Both contracts terminate June 30, 2008. This RFP specifies the replacement central system, retailer terminal, and connecting network to replace the current system. The term of the resulting contract will be July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2018. The successful implementation of the resulting system will allow the Lottery to continue sales, which now run about $240 Million per year resulting in transfers to the State of Kansas of about $67 Million annually. The successful vendor will recoup their programming and implementation costs from service fees charged over the 10 year life of the contract. The programming costs are estimated to be in the range of $625,000, retailer hardware $10,000,000 for 2000 retailers, and $600,000 for central site hardware at two locations. The fee structure will be determined by the responses to the RFP and the negotiating process. Current fees are based on "net online sales" but future fees may be a flat rate, a percentage of net or gross sales, or some combination of the two. This project is included in our current three year information technology plan.

**For the Reporting Period**: Project is complete. Go-Live was 6/29/08 as planned. The first two months after going live were difficult, with many bugs and omissions by GTech. We are negotiating damages with GTech per the contract.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🥚 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Online Gaming System, Communications Network and Related Services RFP (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $78,045 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $72,360 | | |
| External Cost: | 5,685 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 4/3/06 | Estimated End: | 7/27/07 |

**Execution - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **7/26/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$139,440** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$126,365** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$139,440** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$120,680** |
| **External Cost:** | **$0** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$5,685** |
| **Execution Start:** | **7/30/07** | **Execution End:** | **8/3/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **7/17/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $2,000 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 8/08 | Estimated End: | 8/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬯ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Racing and Gaming Commission (KRGC)

### Kansas Expanded Lottery Act (KELA) II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 7/26/07 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 9/19/07 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/22/07 | |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 6/30/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $680,045 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $150,000 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $675,045 | Execution Cost to Date: | $58,675 |
|   Internal Cost: | $129,475 |   Internal Cost to Date: | $56,400 |
|   External Cost: | $545,570 |   External Cost to Date: | $2,275 |
| Execution Start: | 7/16/08 | Execution End: | 5/20/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 12/22/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Fund | 80% | Ambient Consulting |
| Racing Fund | 20% | |

**Completed**

This project is the implementation and modification of the Iowa gaming licensing system. The implementation was originally started to allow the KRGC to meet its statutory requirements set out in Kansas Expanded Lottery Act (2007 Senate Bill 66). Through that process it was decided to merge the out-dated racing licensing system into the new gaming system to allow the agency to make needed upgrades. This project will also allow the agency to abandon the current racing system that is installed on an AS-400 with software that is no longer supported by IBM. Through the original project plan, the decision was made to include all of the necessary racino (gaming at racetracks) and casino regulatory infrastructure under this one project. The recast of this project sets out the implementation of the racino (gaming at racetracks) facility infrastructure as its own subproject and will completely remove casino infrastructure from this project to make it its own planned project at a later date. Because of legal challenges to the KELA, delays in implementation of the racinos because of management contracts, and other political issues, the timeframes once believed to have been more solid have now become more fluid and unpredictable. While it might make sense to create one project encompassing all infrastructure, time is a bigger factor in this decision and the infrastructure needs to be in place at the racinos for the licensing system to work. We don't expect the need for the system at the casinos for a year or two.

| Planned Overall Cost (cumulative) | | Actual expenditures (not cumulative) |
|---|---|---|
| KELA I | $1,795,000 | $323,366 |
| KELA II | $1,003,411 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

### Project Gains
KELA I – Gaming licensing system implementation.
KELA II – Conversion and merger of pari-mutuel licensing system and racino infrastructure.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⬤ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Kansas Expanded Lottery Act (KELA) (Continued)

**For the reporting period:** The conversion of the AS/400 licensing system into the new gaming licensing system is completed.  Currently one Casino in Dodge City is set to open in the fall of this year.  The Kansas Expanded Lottery Act project ended on 12/22/08.  With the Woodlands, Wichita Greyhound Park and Camptown Greyhound Park closures the need for the Racino Infrastucture Project has ended.   The Kansas tracks remain hopeful that during the legislative session changes might be made to existing gaming legislation enabling them to reopen at a later date.

**Subproject II – Conversion and Merger of Parimutuel Licensing System - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/30/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$203,475** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$58,675** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$118,475** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$56,400** |
| **External Cost:** | **$85,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$2,275** |
| **Execution Start:** | **7/16/08** | **Execution End:** | **1/13/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **12/22/08** |

**Subproject III – Racino Infrastructure – CLOSED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **6/30/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$471,570** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$11,000** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$460,570** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/13/09** | **Execution End:** | **5/20/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **12/22/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $5,000 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $5,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 5/09 | Estimated End: | 6/09 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 12/08 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 12/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🥠 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   ✛   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS)

**KPERS Disaster Recovery / Hot Site**

I P

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 11/2/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 8/03/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $257,517 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| PIER Final Project Costs: | $252,282 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $319,275 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $255,591 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $250,616 |
| Internal Cost: | $8,166 | Internal Cost to Date: | $6,981 |
| External Cost: | $247,425 | External Cost to Date: | $243,635 |
| Execution Start: | 10/9/07 | Execution End: | 10/31/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 6/22/09 |

Funding Source for Project Cost    Vendor

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| KPERS Fund (Budget Cost) | 96% | Sagitec, Inc. |
| KPERS Fund (Salaries) | 4% | |

**Completed**

KPERS' Disaster Recovery Project has two major components: 1. Internal processes involves backing up over the fiber network utilizing an enterprise level backup or imaging solution. 2. Hot site involves locating or utilizing servers at a determined hot site to receive replicated data from KPERS primary servers. The combination of these two components will provide KPERS continuous uptime in the event of a man made or natural disaster.

**For the reporting period:** PIER received with final costs reported.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $1,374 | PIER Final Planning Cost: | $1,166 |
| Internal Cost: | $1,374 | Internal Cost: | $1,166 |
| Estimated Start: | 10/06 | Estimated End: | 10/07 |

**Execution - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **8/3/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$255,591** | **PIER Final Execution Costs:** | **$250,616** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$8,166** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$6,981** |
| **External Cost:** | **$247,425** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$243,635** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/9/07** | **Execution End:** | **10/31/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $552 | PIER Final Close-Out Cost: | $500 |
| Internal Cost: | $552 | Internal Cost to Date: | $500 |
| Estimated Start: | 11/08 | Estimated End: | 12/08 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ Project on hold. |
| I Infrastructure Project | ⊕ Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | 🥏 Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS) (Continued)

**KPERS Integrated Technology System (KITS) (Monitoring – refer to pg. 11)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 11/19/99 | | |
| CITO Recast Approval: | 8/19/03 | | |
| CITO Recast Approval: | 8/12/04 | | |
| Project Cost: | $8,000,000 | Project Cost to Date: | $7,994,261 |
| Plan Start: | 7/03 | Plan End: | 1/09 |
| | | Plan End: | 7/09 |
| | | Adjusted Plan End: | 6/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State-KPERS Fund | 100% | Sagitec - Development |
| | | MTG – I.V.& V. |

**Completed**

The Workflow Reengineering with Imaged Document Management – Image2000 was recast as the Information Systems Replacement Project in August 2003. The Kansas Public Employees Retirement System (KPERS) administers three statewide retirement systems for the states public employees: KPERS, Kansas Police & Fire (KP&F), and Kansas Retirement System for Judges. The systems total assets are approximately $12 billion, making it the 159th largest pension fund in the world. KPER's membership has increased 10 fold and now serves approximately 240,000 members. Nearly 1,500 employers participate in KPERS, including the state, all counties, all school districts, and numerous cities, public libraries, hospitals, and other governmental units. KPERS relies on computer systems that are over 30 years old, require manual intervention, and provide only rudimentary support to business operations. This montage of systems stores its data in computer files that contain redundant and poorly linked information. The Information Systems Replacement Project seeks to replace the current computer systems with a modern information system that has better flexibility, automates more business functions, maintains more reliable information, and provides better access to information by KPERS staff, employers, and members. With the approval of Subproject II on February 28, 2005, the Information Systems Replacement Project was renamed to KPERS Integrated Technology System (KITS).

| **Planned Overall Cost** (cumulative) | **Actual Expenditures** (not cumulative) |
|---|---|
| Workflow Reengineering w/Imaged Document Mgmt – Image2000 | |
| $2,780,968 | $1,330,373 |
| KPERS Integrated Technology System | |
| $10,780,968 | Total Expenditures for Workflow Engineering plus Project Cost to Date |

**Project Gains**

Workflow Reengineering with Imaged Document Management – Image2000 – Implementation of an Imaging system. Conversion of paper records to digital images.

KPERS Integrated Technology System – Replacement of the current computer systems with a modern information system that has better flexibility, automates more business functions, maintains more reliable information, and provides better access to information by KPERS staff, employers, and members.

**For the reporting period:** All phases of this project are completed or in the final stages of deployment. This project is in wrap-up mode. Close out activities remain to be completed for the project. However, the agency has several efforts currently underway which utilize the same resources. As a result, close out activities for the KITS project may not get underway until late spring 2009.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🌑 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KPERS Integrated Technology System (KITS) (Continued)**

Subproject I – Detailed Business Process Specifications(FSR)- **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 8/19/03 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $590,000 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $589,261 |
| Plan Start: | 7/03 | Plan End: | 7/04 |
| | | Adjusted End: | 12/04 |
| | | Adjusted End: | 2/05 |

Subproject II – Increment I, Enrollment, Maint., Workflow  **- COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 2/28/05 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $1,616,009 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $1,616,009 |
| Plan Start: | 2/05 | Plan End: | 10/05 |
| | | Adjusted End: | 11/05 |

Subproject III – Increment II, Employer & Application **- COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 5/10/05 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $1,218,235 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $1,218,235 |
| Plan Start: | 6/05 | | |
| Adjusted Start: | 5/05 | Plan End: | 1/06 |
| | | Adjusted End: | 12/05 |

Subproject IV – Increment III, Calculation - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 11/3/05 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $898,344 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $898,344 |
| Plan Start: | 10/05 | Plan End: | 5/06 |
| Plan Start: | 11/05 | Plan End: | 12/06 |

Subproject V – Increment IV, Payment - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 12/15/05 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $1,023,412 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $1,023,412 |
| Plan Start: | 2/06 | | |
| Plan Start: | 12/05 | Plan End: | 12/06 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🏺 | Reporting insufficient. |
| * | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

**KPERS Integrated Technology System (KITS) (Continued)**

Subproject VI – Increment V, Employer Web Portal - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 4/20/06 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $725,760 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $725,760 |
| Plan Start: | 5/06 | Plan End: | 12/06 |
| Adjusted Start: | 4/06 | | |

Subproject VII – Increment VI, Employer Web Remittance and OGLI - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 2/15/07 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $977,840 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $312,500 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $312,500 |
| Plan Start: | 1/07 | Plan End: | 7/07 |
| Plan Start: | 3/07 | Plan End: | 10/07 |

Subproject VIII – Increment VII, KITS Enhancements - Member Web Portal - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 8/3/07 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $950,400 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $807,870 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $870,250 |
| Plan Start: | 7/07 | Plan End: | 7/08 |
| Plan Start: | 8/07 | Plan End: | 4/08 |
| | | Plan End: | 9/08 |
| | | Adjusted Plan End: | 11/08 |

Subproject IX – Increment VIII, KITS Enhancements - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 8/27/07 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $807,870 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $740,490 |
| Plan Start: | 3/08 | Plan End: | 3/09 |
| Plan Start: | 8/07 | Plan End: | 5/09 |
| | | Adjusted Plan End: | 10/08 |

Subproject X – Close-Out - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plan Cost: | $0 | | |
| Plan Start: | 7/08 | Plan End: | 1/09 |
| Plan Start: | 4/09 | Plan End: | 7/09 |
| Adjusted Plan Start: | 5/09 | Adjusted Plan End: | 6/09 |

**Completed**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | 🥐 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS) (Continued)
**Platform Consolidation**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 11/3/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 9/19/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $1,750,000 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $870,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $1,734,500 | Execution Cost to Date: | $1,768,237 |
| Internal Cost: | $82,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $108,900 |
| External Cost: | $1,652,500 | External Cost to Date: | $1,659,337 |
| Execution Start: | 10/1/07 | Execution End: | 2/7/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 2/27/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| KPERS Fund (Budget Cost) | 95% | Sagitec Solutions, Inc |
| KPERS Fund (Salaries) | 5% | |

**Completed**

KPERS' Platform Consolidation Project has two major components: Migrate KITS database from AS/400 DB2 to SQL Server and Migrate KPERS' imaging system from an Optical based AS/400 system to a Direct Access Storage Device (DASD) based Windows system. The platform consolidation project will complete the migration of KPERS' business support systems, with the exception of the general ledger system, from the multiple platforms, (Mainframe, Midrange and Windows) that evolved over the last 30 years to a single supportable architecture that will provide business users with streamlined functionality, improve productivity, and add web functionality for employers and members. Having KPERS' core business systems running on multiple platforms makes support and disaster recovery problematic and the outdated optical storage utilized by the imaging system exacerbates the situation. Migrating to a single platform will allow KPERS to better assure uninterrupted retiree benefit payments as well as employer and member services.

**For the reporting period:** Except for the PIER reports, the project has completed all the deliverables on schedule and within budget.

| | |
|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | Reporting insufficient. |
| * *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

**Platform Consolidation (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
    Estimated Project Cost:    $4,000
      Internal Cost:    $4,000
    Estimated Start:    8/06        Estimated End:    10/07

**Subproject I – Core Infrastructure - COMPLETED**
    **CITO Approval:**    **9/19/07**
    **Execution Cost:**    **$293,711**    **Execution Cost to Date:**  **$293,711**
      **Internal Cost:**    **$4,711**      **Internal Cost to Date:**    **$4,711**
      **External Cost:**    **$289,000**      **External Cost to Date:**  **$289,000**
    **Execution Start:**    **10/1/07**    **Execution End:**    **2/7/08**
                             **Adjusted Execution End:  12/18/07**

**Subproject II – Application and Data Migration-COMPLETED**
    **CITO Approval:**    **12/27/07**
    **Execution Cost:**    **$1,440,789**    **Execution Cost to Date: $1,474,526**
      **Internal Cost:**    **$77,289**      **Internal Cost to Date:**  **$104,189**
      **External Cost:**    **$1,363,500**      **External Cost to Date: $1,370,337**
    **Execution Start:**    **2/11/08**    **Execution End:**    **2/5/09**
    **Adjusted Execution Start:**    **1/2/08**    **Adjusted Execution End:**    **2/27/09**

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**
    Estimated Project Cost:    $11,500
      Internal Cost:    $1,500
      External Cost:    10,000
    Estimated Start:    2/09      Estimated End:    2/09

**Completed**

| Symbol | Meaning | Symbol | Meaning |
|---|---|---|---|
| (green smiley) | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| (red circle) | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| (star) | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | (football) | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS) (Continued)

**Security Enhancements Project**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 11/3/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 8/3/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $1,068,240 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $600,000 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $1,043,700 | Execution Cost to Date: | $649,782 |
| Internal Cost: | $64,700 | Internal Cost to Date: | $49,715 |
| External Cost: | $979,000 | External Cost to Date: | $600,067 |
| Execution Start: | 8/28/07 | Execution End: | 2/18/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| KPERS Fund (Budget Cost) | 92% | Fishnet, Inc. |
| KPERS Fund (Salaries) | 8% | |

**Completed**

KPERS' Security Project has four major components: 1. Security Assessment including an architecture and design review, a secure application architecture review, a native application security review a host level security review, an application security assessment and a security product review and recommendations. 2. Log on Controls including three factor identification for employers, key fob identification for employers, and three factor identification for members. 3. Application Security including integrating security recommendations into KITS, and implementing appropriate infrastructure and software to secure KITS. 4. Intrusion Prevention / Detection including implementation of security recommendations and implementation of software and infrastructure to make intrusion more difficult and to immediately identify intrusions should they occur.

**For the Reporting Period**:  We finished the execution phase by the 2/18/09 deadline, will close out the project by the 4/1/09 deadline, and our expectations are under budget.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ☆ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🥐 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Security Enhancement Project (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $13,740 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $13,740 | | |
| External Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/06 | Estimated End: | 10/07 |

**Subproject I – Infrastructure Upgrades - COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **8/3/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$614,180** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$353,482** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$41,180** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$24,215** |
| **External Cost:** | **$573,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$329,267** |
| **Execution Start:** | **8/28/07** | **Execution End:** | **5/8/08** |

**Subproject II – Logon Controls - COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **8/3/07** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$429,520** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$296,300** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$23,520** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$25,500** |
| **External Cost:** | **$406,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$270,800** |
| **Execution Start:** | **2/7/08** | **Execution End:** | **2/18/09** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $10,800 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $10,800 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 2/09 | Estimated End: | 4/09 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬯ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   ✛   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Department of (KDOR)

**Kansas Apportioned International Registration System Replacement-Performance and Registration Information System Management (KAIR-PRISM)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 5/11/06 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 10/31/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 1/4/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $1,276,548 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| PIER Final Project Cost: | $1,154,702 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $555,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $1,259,010 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $1,136,836 |
| Internal Cost: | $102,590 | Internal Cost to Date: | $121,495 |
| External Cost: | $1,156,420 | External Cost to Date: | $1,015,341 |
| Execution Start: | 1/24/07 | Execution End: | 12/11/07 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/11/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 5/28/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 9% | 3M MVS Company |
| Information Network of Kansas Grant | 21% | |
| Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin. Grant | 46% | |
| Comm. Veh. Info Systems & Networks Grant | 24% | |

**Completed**

The Kansas Apportioned International Registration (KAIR) system will be replaced and the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) requirements added in this project. The KAIR system supports the administration of the International Registration Plan (IRP) apportioned commercial vehicle registration program. Authority for these responsibilities is outlined in Kansas Statutes K.S.A. 8-1, 100 through 8-1, 123a. The IRP program is a multi-jurisdiction reciprocity agreement that provides one-step interstate registration for interstate motor carriers. The program is responsible for the apportioned registration of commercial vehicles operating on the highways of Kansas and used in interstate commerce. KAIR is a mainframe-based application that was developed by KDOR Information Services associates and last re-written in 1994. This project will replace KAIR with a web-based solution for truck registrations, which is accessible to citizens, businesses and government through their personal computer. The office of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) is strongly encouraging Kansas to add the PRISM requirements to the existing registration process. The PRISM requirements will benefit Kansas and the driving public by using commercial vehicle registration sanctions as an incentive to improve motor carrier safety. Due to the acquisition of Archon Technologies by 3M, internal business structure problems occurred in the execution of the project. The JCIT was briefed on the project status and implementation delay occurred on December 19, 2007. A recovery plan was filed on January 25, 2008 and placed the project on "Alert" status. Also referred to as Kansas Apportioned Registration Data System (KARDS).

**For the reporting period:** PIER received with final costs reported.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Apportioned International Registration System Replacement-Performance and Registration Information System Management (KAIR-PRISM) (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $13,842 | PIER Final Planning Cost: | $14,170 |
| Internal Cost: | $13,842 | Internal Cost to Date: | $14,170 |
| Estimated Start: | 8/05 | Estimated End: | 1/07 |

**Subproject I – Requirements Definition & Design - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 1/4/07 | | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $280,459 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $295,854 |
| Internal Cost: | $24,834 | Internal Cost to Date: | $42,786 |
| External Cost: | $255,625 | External Cost to Date: | $253,068 |
| Execution Start: | 1/24/07 | Execution End: | 4/30/07 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 1/18/07 | Adjusted Execution End: | 8/10/07 |

**Subproject II – Development and Conversion - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 1/4/07 | | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $147,912 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $151,841 |
| Internal Cost: | $13,992 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $133,920 | External Cost to Date: | $151,841 |
| Execution Start: | 5/1/07 | Execution End: | 9/28/07 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 12/26/07 | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/11/08 |

**Subproject III – Testing and Training - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 1/4/07 | | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $485,467 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $332,722 |
| Internal Cost: | $25,342 | Internal Cost to Date: | $29,040 |
| External Cost: | $460,125 | External Cost to Date: | $303,682 |
| Execution Start: | 7/24/07 | Execution End: | 11/14/07 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 1/23/08 | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/11/08 |

**Subproject IV – Implementation _ COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 1/4/07 | | |
| Execution Project Cost: | $327,922 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $321,211 |
| Internal Cost: | $21,172 | Internal Cost to Date: | $14,461 |
| External Cost: | $306,750 | External Cost to Date: | $306,750 |
| Execution Start: | 6/4/07 | Execution End: | 12/11/07 |
| Adjusted Execution Start: | 5/14/08 | Adjusted Execution End: | 7/11/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🛢 | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Apportioned International Registration System Replacement-Performance and Registration Information System Management (KAIR-PRISM) (Continued)**

**Subproject V – Project Management - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **1/4/07** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$17,250** | **PIER Final Execution Costs:** | **$35,208** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$17,250** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$35,208** |
| **External Cost:** | **$0** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/24/07** | **Execution End:** | **12/10/07** |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | **12/20/07** | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **7/11/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $3,696 | PIER Final Close-Out Cost: | $3,696 |
| Internal Cost: | $3,696 | Internal Cost to Date: | $3,696 |
| Estimated Start: | 12/07 | Estimated End: | 3/08 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 7/08 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 4/09 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)

### Automated Medication Dispensing System - LSH

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 3/13/07 |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 12/20/07 |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 10/09/08 |
| **CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 10/17/08 |
| Project Cost: | $587,628 (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $57,912 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $568,028 | Execution Cost to Date: | $567,620 |
| Internal Cost: | $77,696 | Internal Cost to Date: | $77,288 |
| External Cost: | $490,332 | External Cost to Date: | $490,332 |
| Execution Start: | 1/24/08 | Execution End: | 4/2/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 3/31/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 17% | Omnicell |
| State Institution Fund | 83% | |

**Completed**

The purpose of this project is to acquire and implement an automated medication dispensing system for Larned State Hospital to safely and efficiently meet the medication requirements of its patients in the Isaac Ray Building. The investment in the automated medication dispensing system technology will provide greater drug distribution-administration efficiency, increased medication safety by virtue of pharmacists remotely monitoring inventory levels and authorizing the first dose for the patient, improved accuracy in billing, and greater medication security guarding against pilferage. The system will also enable the maintenance of critical patient information associated with the dispensing of medication, such as pain scale data, that will enable hospital staff to better care for patients. The State Board of Pharmacy and consultants from the Kansas University Medical Center have recommended this type of system for the new facility. Succesful implementation at this facility could result in expanded use of this technology in other Larned facilities and other SRS State hospitals. **Omnicell was awarded a contract in December 2007. Larned State Hospital IT staff accepted equipment prior to obtaining CITO approval on our Detailed Project Plan. As a result, SRS Central Information Technology Services (ITS) became directly involved with project oversight. SRS Central ITS contacted Omnicell to ensure no further activities took place until proper CITO approval was obtained. SRS Central ITS worked with administrative staff from all SRS institutions to ensure the governance is in place to mitigate this from occurring again.

**For the reporting period:** Omnicell arrived on site at Larned State Hospital the first week of 1/09. All of the Automated Medication Dispensing cabinets have been installed and implemented in each of the different units and the night locker. The Secure Vault equipment was delivered mid 3/09 and project staff completed the install, configuration and implementation on 3/27. Training of hospital staff on the Omnicell equipment is complete. Execution phase completed 3/31. Currently preparing the PIER and anticipate submission within the next quarter.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 💊 | Reporting insufficient. |

***** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Automated Medication Dispensing System - LSH (Continued)

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $17,440 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $17,440 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/05 | Estimated End: | 10/08 |

**Subproject I – Pre Approval – COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Execution Cost:** | **$179,906** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$179,906** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$12,656** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$12,656** |
| **External Cost:** | **$167,250** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$167,250** |
| **Execution Start:** | **1/24/08** | **Execution End:** | **9/18/08** |

**Subproject II – Post Approval - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/17/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$388,122** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$387,714** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$65,040** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$64,632** |
| **External Cost:** | **$323,082** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$323,082** |
| **Execution Start:** | **10/31/08** | **Execution End:** | **4/2/09** |
| **Adjusted Execution Start:** | **10/27/08** | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **3/31/09** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $2,160 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $2,160 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 4/09 | Estimated End: | 5/09 |

**Completed**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*  ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)

**Human Services Management (HSM) Road Map II**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 3/13/07 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: | 1/10/08 | |
| CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval | 5/30/08 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 6/2/08 | |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 11/6/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $191,024 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $190,584 | Execution Cost to Date: | $190,816 |
| Internal Cost: | $4,944 | Internal Cost to Date: | $5,176 |
| External Cost: | $185,640 | External Cost to Date: | $185,640 |
| Execution Start: | 11/17/08 | Execution End: | 12/23/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 1/23/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | Fox Systems, Inc. |

**Completed**

The HSM Roadmap will serve as the strategic implementation plan for the HSM project. The HSM will be a business and technology project to produce outcome-based, client-centered, integrated delivery of services across needs-based and contribution-based programs. HSM will provide SRS with a comprehensive view of a client across programs in order to integrate service delivery and achieve positive outcomes. This will be accomplished by implementing an integrated infrastructure approach. This approach will allow multiple programs to be supported, using consistent and standard-based technology and management practices. By taking a customer-focused approach to serving Kansans in place of the normal "stove piped" program approach, more effective service delivery can be provided by better determining the services that Kansans are eligible for by providing a single interface to various programs.

| **Planned Overall Cost** (cumulative) | | **Actual Expenditures** (not cumulative) |
|---|---|---|
| HSM I - | $553,220 | $369,071 |
| HSM II- | $560,095 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

**Project Gains**

HSM I – Analyzed and documented the current state of the SRS organization, business processes and technology. Developed the overall vision of where SRS wants to go and created a roadmap to reach that future state.

HSM II – Performed a feasibility study to determine the funding justification for the HSM project. Created the Implementation Advanced Planning Document (IAPD) to outline and justify the project to SRS' federal partners.

**For the reporting period:** SRS and Fox Systems, Inc. have successfully met all deliverables. The project is complete.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🥏 | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*       + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Human Services Management (HSM) Road Map II (Continued)**

**Execution - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **11/6/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$190,584** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$190,816** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$4,944** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$5,176** |
| **External Cost:** | **$185,640** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$185,640** |
| **Execution Start:** | **11/17/08** | **Execution End:** | **12/23/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **1/23/09** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $440 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $440 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 12/08 | Estimated End: | 12/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*       ╋ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)

**Crew Card Reporting IV - (Monitoring – refer to pg. 11)**

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 12/9/04 |
| CITO Recast Approval: | 6/30/05 |
| CITO Recast Approval: | 4/25/06 |
| CITO Recast Approval: | 2/1/07 |

P

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Cost: | $705,149 | Project Cost to Date: | $840,855 |
| **Project Cost: | $754,865 | | |
| Plan Start: | 5/04 | Plan End: | 3/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 5/21/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Highway Fund | 100% | Quilogy |

**Completed**

The crew card system will assist the KDOT Maintenance personnel located in six geographic districts by providing them with a user friendly interface to capture accomplishments, materials used, employee, and equipment time data in one system. With several hundred employees in numerous individual crews, KDOT needs to move toward a more effective solution while also bringing data collection closer to real-time. The crew card system can be used to retain detailed historical data on a daily basis and generate weekly reporting to management. In June 2005, the Crew Card Reporting project was recast to the Crew Card Reporting II. In April 2005, Crew Card Reporting II was recast into Crew Card Reporting III. In February 2007, Crew Card III was recast into Crew Card Reporting IV. **An oversight in the dollar amount reportedly spent on Subproject I was made during preparation of the recast project plan approved on February 1, 2007. The error does not affect the overall cost of the project.

**Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)   Actual Expenditures (not cumulative)**

| | Planned Overall Cost (cumulative) | Actual Expenditures (not cumulative) |
|---|---|---|
| Crew Card I | - $598,216 | $48,000 |
| Crew Card II | - $953,797 | $150,741 |
| Crew Card III | - $953,797 | $0 |
| Crew Card IV | - $953,797 | $840,855 |

**Project Gains**

Crew Card I – Initial system requirements gathered. Development of early prototypes using .Net technology.

Crew Card II – Refined discovery and design effort. Documented business requirements. Initial module development with .Net technology.

Crew Card III – Further development of system modules. Testing to meet requirements.

Crew Card IV – Assessment of difficulties with architectural approach and design of system. Complete appropriate modifications. Complete development, testing and implementation of system.

**For the Reporting Period:** PIER received with full project cost for Crew Card I, II, III and IV as $1,039,596.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Crew Card Reporting IV (Continued)**

Development, Testing & Implementation - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Recast Approval: | 2/1/07 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $705,149 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $840,855 |
| **Plan Cost: | $754,845 | | |
| Plan Start: | 2/07 | Plan End: | 1/08 |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Recast Approval: | 2/1/07 | | |
| Plan Cost: | $0 | Subproject Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Plan Start: | 1/08 | Plan End: | 3/08 |
| | | Adjusted Plan End: | 2/09 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |
| * | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

### Right of Way Outdoor Advertising System (OAS) II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 11/15/07 | |
| ***CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 8/15/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $30,000 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $41,058 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $30,000 | Execution Cost to Date: | $30,000 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Costs to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $30,000 | External Cost to Date: | $30,000 |
| Execution Start: | 9/1/08 | Execution End: | 12/8/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 2/8/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State Highway Fund | 100% | Motorola |

**Completed**

KDOT's Bureau of Right of Way (ROW) faced a substantial change in business practice to the licensing of outdoor advertising signage arising from new legislation passed April 26, 2006 (SB 253) by the legislature. These changes required that each sign be individually licensed on a biennial basis as opposed to the prior practice of licensing each sign owner on a county by county basis per year.  In addition, rather than collecting a flat fee for each county the sign owner was in, the new law required that fees be collected based upon the size of the sign face.  After an analysis of the current system it was determined it would take about as much effort to modify the six (6) year old Oracle forms and reports system as it would to develop a customized web-based system. In addition, once the system was in production, Right of Way made some changes to the business workflows and identified some new reports that were not part of the negotiated and contracted original OAS installation.  Also, updates to the original reports, letters and billing packages were also requested.  These are enhancements to the COTS that are being done as an extension of the original project.  **The Bureau of Right of Way in the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) upgraded a system for managing the Outdoor Advertising System (OAS).  Significant changes were made in the way KDOT permits and charges fees to companies constructing and owning highway billboard signs.  This required a new billboard tracking system to comply with the changes.  The cost of that new system was $243,207 and was completed in 6/07.  The OAS had been running for six months when KDOT decided enhancements needed to be added to the system.  With this additional work, cost of the effort exceeded the $250,000 threshold for CITO reporting.  A project plan was developed for CITO approval in 11/07 which encompassed the original system ($243,223) as well as the effort and cost of the enhancement effort ($139,798).  ***Tasks associated with additional report functions were omitted from the original schedule in error resulting in an extended end date.  The project cost was not impacted as these efforts were included in the original budget.  A recast project plan was submitted and received CITO approval on 8/15/08

| **Planned Overall Cost** (cumulative) | | **Actual Expenditures** (not cumulative) |
|---|---|---|
| **Right of Way Outdoor Advertising System I- | $383,021 | $353,021 |
| Right of Way Outdoor Advertising System II- | $383,021 | See above Execution Cost to Date |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

### Right of Way Outdoor Advertising System (OAS) II (Continued)

**Project Gains**

Right of Way Outdoor Advertising System I – Various reports, letters and billing packages designed, developed, built and tested.  This portion of the outdoor advertising system was installed.

Right of Way Outdoor Advertising System II – Additional planned functionality.   Reporting functions migration and conversion.  Report configurations.  Migration of old reports to new and migration of associated data to produce reports.

**For the reporting period:**   At the time of the 1/09 quarterly report there were two deliverables that the vendor needed to make corrections to before KDOT would accept them.   These two deliverables were delivered on 2/8/09 and accepted by KDOT.  The project is now considered complete.

**Completed**

**Additional Functionality - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **8/15/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$30,000** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$30,000** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$0** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$30,000** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$30,000** |
| **Execution Start:** | **9/1/08** | **Execution End:** | **12/8/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **2/8/09** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 12/08 | Estimated End: | 1/09 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

**Traffic Record System Development and Implementation Program (TRCC)**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:     4/5/07
Project Cost:     $737,000  (Planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:    $0

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $675,750 | Execution Cost to Date: | $690,959 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $675,750 | External Cost to Date: | $690,959 |
| Execution Start: | 4/9/07 | Execution End: | 9/5/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 9/30/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>       <u>Vendor</u>
Federal Highway Administration    100%    MTG Management Consultants, LLC
                                                  Soos Creek Consulting, LLC

**Completed**

A planned project was submitted to CITO in the fall of 2006 that defines an effort to identify and coordinate information systems that need to be modified or developed to achieve more efficient interoperability and sharing of traffic records.  This project is referenced as the "Traffic Records Coordination Committee" (TRCC).  While this is the name of the planned project there is also a committee that is referred to as the Traffic Records Coordination Committee.  This committee was formally established to have the responsibility and authority for coordinating traffic records programs across state and local agencies.  A strategic plan was developed which identified 51 projects that could potentially be developed, depending on available funding, over the next 10 years.  A very rough estimate of the cost of these projects is $24,700,000.  The strategic plan identified 17 of those 51 projects were already active and funded from other funding sources.  The goal of this project is to perform preparatory work for the development of a Traffic Record System (TRS) that will provide the ability to gather traffic safety information in a timely, accurate and consistent nature.

**For the Reporting Period:**  This project represents the 2-year contract for coordinating and managing the implementation of the Traffic Records System Strategic Plan.  During the past quarter, the consultants have been coordinating efforts being undertaken by the implementation vendor, Gensis10 and other state resources such as the KDOT, KHP and KBI staff.  In addition, the consultants have been reviewing materials produced by the implementation vendor surrounding the TRS detailed design and providing input to ensure the TRS complements the overall state strategic IT direction. Three additional documents were completed by the consultants during the past quarter including an update to the original TRS strategic plan in order to reflect TRCC decisions made and project progress over the past year.  The project website was also updated by the consultants in order to provide the most current TRS documentation to all TRCC stakeholders. The project is now complete with the exception of closeout activities which will be completed during October.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🟢 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Traffic Record System Development and Implementation Program (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $54,250 | | |
| External Cost: | $54,250 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 1/07 | Estimated End: | 3/07 |

**Develop Non-Interstate - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **4/5/07** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$675,750** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$690,959** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$0** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$675,750** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$690,959** |
| **Execution Start:** | **4/9/07** | **Execution End:** | **9/5/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **9/30/08** |

Close Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $7,000 | | |
| External Cost: | $7,000 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 9/08 | Estimated End: | 9/08 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 10/08 | Adjusted Estimated End: | 10/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## REGENTS

### Emporia State University (ESU)

**Enterprise Resource Planning System**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 2/3/05
CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 8/18/05
Project Cost: $7,491,002  (Planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: $1,460,709

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $7,473,895 | Execution Cost to Date: | $5,834,475 |
| Internal Cost: | $406,313 | Internal Cost to Date: | $252,357 |
| External Cost: | $7,067,582 | External Cost to Date: | $5,582,118 |
| Execution Start: | 4/15/05 | Execution End: | 12/7/07 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| General University | 98% | Sungard Higher Education (HE) |
| TITLE III | 2% | |

**Completed**

In the fall of 2001, Emporia State University (ESU) began to investigate the feasibility of replacing its in-house developed and maintained legacy administrative and business information systems with an integrated and commercial solution. Largely due to significant budget challenges, it was not possible to continue with the project, although the need for such system replacement continues to the present. In 2003, Wichita State University (WSU) began the process of reviewing available software to replace its legacy applications. When the RFP was released for the WSU system, ESU was included as a participant. Staff and administrators from ESU participated in the software demonstrations and review processes. This partnership provides a considerable opportunity to efficiency and cost savings in purchase, training, and implementation. Accordingly, after significant review and evaluation, the universities decided to purchase, install, and implement Sungard SCT Banner. Through the implementation of Sungard SCT Banner, ESU will improve operational efficiency and its ability to provide enhanced, web native information services to the ESU community. ESU will utilize the project to analyze current business processes and workflows and map them to the best practices of the SCT Banner offering in order to streamline operations in all ESU functional areas. This project is in planning. The detailed project plan is anticipated by July 2005.

**For the Reporting Period**: The Luminis Portal (Buzz In), Finance, Advancement, Financial Aid, Student/AR and Human Resources core Banner systems have gone live and are currently being maintained by the respective functional and technical teams. The Enterprise Data Warehouse successfully went live on December 7, 2007. Custom report development efforts continue to progress with a focus shifting to analytical reports derived from the Enterprise Data Warehouse environment. The execution phase of the Emporia State University Enterprise Resource Planning project was completed on December 7, 2007.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* + Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Enterprise Resource Planning System (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Cost: | $11,880 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/04 | Estimated End: | 4/05 |

**Execution - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **8/18/05** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$7,473,895** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$5,834,475** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$406,313** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$252,357** |
| **External Cost:** | **$7,067,582** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$5,582,118** |
| **Execution Start:** | **4/15/05** | **Execution End:** | **12/7/07** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $5,227 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 12/07 | Estimated End: | 1/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |
| * | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Published:  August 2009

## Kansas State University (KSU)

**Legacy Application System Empowered Replacement III (LASER) - (Monitoring – refer to pg. 11)**

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 8/19/04 |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 1/3/05 |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 6/9/06 |
| CITO Recast Plan Approval: | 10/5/06 |

P

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Cost LASER III | $4,954,894 | Project Cost to Date: | $4,977,170 |
| Plan Start: | 5/06 | Plan End: | 12/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 5/21/09 |

Funding Source for Project Cost                     Vendor
KSU Tuition                                    100%    Oracle/PeopleSoft - Application
                                                      CIBER – Financial Aid Consulting
                                                      Employer Mgmt Solutions (EMS) - Admissions

**Completed**

The Legacy Application System Empowered Replacement (LASER) Project will replace the major central information systems that Kansas State University is currently operating on an aging System/390 with modern, web focused, information systems, which operate in the distributed Sun/Solaris operating environment.  The general names for the systems being replaced are the student and financial systems.  However, significant subsystems involving admissions processing, student financial aid, student billing and accounts receivable, general ledger, and accounts payable are being replaced.  Some new processing functions are being introduced by the replacement systems.  Purchasing and advanced recruiting applications are adding functionality that was not present in the aging legacy systems.  **LASER II** - KSU had a project scope change to replace the Admissions implementation with Advanced Recruitment implementation, and delay the Admissions implementation until later in the project.  The Executive CITO had a meeting with KSU on February 3, 2005 to determine how the change in the scope of the project will affect the overall LASER project.  From that meeting, the Executive CITO and KSU concluded that KSU would recast the project from June 2004 forward including Subprojects II, III, and IV.  **LASER III** - The Oracle Corporation has strongly advised K-State to switch their student system replacement effort from implementing the Oracle Student Solution (OSS) to the Oracle/PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (CS) software. The LASER Project Team spent significant effort thoroughly analyzing this recommendation in order to make a decision in the best interest, both short-term and long-term, for K-State students, faculty, staff and administrators. It was agreed that implementation of Oracle/PeopleSoft Campus Solutions is the best direction for K-State to take in order to provide the overall functionality that is needed by the university.  After Oracle acquired PeopleSoft in late 2004, they changed their product direction. As a result of the shift of effort to PeopleSoft Campus Solutions, they no longer agreed to enhance the OSS to meet K-State needs. They chose to end the development cycle for OSS and focus on merging OSS concepts with the PeopleSoft CS in the long-term to create a new product in the Fusion line of products. With this strategic direction change, the Oracle Corporation recognizes that OSS at its current level of development will not meet K-State's requirements in several areas, thus their recommendation for a product swap.

**Planned Overall Cost** (cumulative)      **Actual Expenditures** (not cumulative)
LASER I   - $12,785,424                      $3,421,402
LASER II  - $13,638,216                      $5,660,299
LASER III - $14,036,595                      $4,977,170

**Project Gains**
LASER I –   Fit Gap, determined necessary customization, defined configuration.
LASER II – Implemented financial system, identified interfaces between student and all other internal and external systems, source of conversion data, build most all conversion programs, created extract files.
LASER III – Put student system in place.
**For the reporting period:**  PIER received with full project cost for LASER I, II and III as $14,058,871.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Legacy Application System Empowered Replacement III (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plan Cost | $34,380 | Cost to Date: | $34,380 |
| Plan Start: | 5/06 | Plan End: | 9/06 |

Build and Implementation - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plan Cost | $4,920,514 | Cost to Date: | $4,942,790 |
| Plan Start: | 10/06 | Plan End: | 6/08 |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**
| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plan Cost: | $0 | Cost to Date: | $0 |
| Plan Start: | 7/08 | Plan End: | 12/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🟤 | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     ✚ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Kansas, University of (KU)

**KU Dark Fiber**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 3/3/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $142,108 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| PIER Final Project Cost: | $139,475 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $57,840 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $142,108 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $139,475 |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $142,108 | External Cost to Date: | $139,475 |
| Execution Start: | 4/1/08 | Execution End: | 8/20/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 5/28/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | None Reported |

**Completed**

This project will install, configure and light dark fiber equipment in the Kansas City POP and on the KU campus. This project's success will provide enhanced availability to researchers and will bring additional grants and revenues to the University of Kansas. The project consists of adding infrastructure to the University's existing infrastructure, above and beyond what is currently in place. Having this additional fiber available will be beneficial in retaining our researchers and communities and make it more attractive for them to stay affiliated with the University of Kansas instead of going to other research universities that have this additional availability for research.

**For the reporting period:** PIER received with final costs reported.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | PIER Final Planning Cost: | $0 |
| Estimated Start: | 12/07 | Estimated End: | 3/08 |

**Phase I – DK Fiber Equipment in POP and KU - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **3/3/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$142,108** | **PIER Final Execution Costs:** | **$139,475** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$0** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$142,108** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$139,475** |
| **Execution Start:** | **4/1/08** | **Execution End:** | **8/20/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | PIER Final Close-Out Cost: | $0 |
| Estimated Start: | 8/08 | Estimated End: | 8/08 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | 🥏 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Kansas, University of (KU) (Continued)

**KU Expansion of Existing Wireless APs**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval: | 4/12/07 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 5/3/07 | |
| Project Cost: | $1,779,765 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| PIER Final Project Cost: | $1,168,829 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $0 | |

**I**   **+**

**P**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $1,748,972 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $1,138,079 |
| **Adjusted Execution Project Cost: | $1,678,972 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $0 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $1,748,972 | External Cost to Date: | $1,138,079 |
| **Adjusted External Cost: | $1,678,972 | | |
| Execution Start: | 5/9/07 | Execution End: | 6/27/08 |
| | | ***Adjusted Execution End: | 8/20/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 6/11/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | None Reported |

**Completed**

This project is from a request and funding initiative from the University of Kansas Student Senate. The scope of this project will be to upgrade the current wireless system with a new, Light Weight AP (Access Points) system.  When completed, the project will provide a new wireless architecture that will allow us to use a Light Weight AP.  The Light Weight AP (LWAP) will decrease the complexity of the wireless network, will be more manageable, will allow us to further expand the network, and will allow us to respond quicker to wireless requests.  The expansion project involves upgrading the existing AP systems, as well as adding more Light Weight AP systems on campus.  **The agency has removed the installation of common area wireless access points (APs) from the scope of this project. The result will be a $70,000 decrease to the budget plan.  ***The agency removed the installation of the Budig wireless access points (APs) from the scope of this project.  These AP's will be addressed in a separate project in the future.  The agency reports there will be no impact to cost or schedule as a result from this change.

**For the Reporting Period:**  PIER received with final costs reported.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |
| **\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | | **+** | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## KU Expansion of Existing Wireless APs (Continued)

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | PIER Final Planning Cost: | $0 |
| Estimated Start: | 3/07 | Estimated End: | 5/07 |

**Execution - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **5/3/07** | | |
| **Execution Project Cost:** | **$1,748,972** | **PIER Final Execution Cost:** | **$1,138,079** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$0** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$0** |
| **External Cost:** | **$1,748,972** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$1,138,079** |
| **Execution Start:** | **5/9/07** | **Execution End:** | **6/27/08** |
| | | ***Adjusted Execution End:** | **8/20/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $30,793 | PIER Final Close-Out Cost: | $30,750 |
| External Costs: | $30,793 | External Cost to Date: | $30,750 |
| Estimated Start: | 6/08 | Estimated End: | 8/08 |
| Adjusted Estimated Start: | 8/08 | | |

**Completed**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Kansas, University of (KU) (Continued)

**PS Financials 9.0**

⭐ **\*\*CITO Detailed Plan Approval:**          10/16/08

P

|  |  |  |
|---|---|---|
| Project Cost: | $432,568 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| PIER Final Project Cost: | $432,568 | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $112,470 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **\*\*Execution Project Cost:** | $0 | PIER Final Execution Costs: | $0 |
| Execution Start: | 2/4/08 | Execution End: | 10/13/08 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 10/3/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | 5/21/09 |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 100% | Peoplesoft |

**Completed**

This is an implementation of a state approved vendor software from the existing PeopleSoft Financial 7.5 software to release 9.0.  This will put us back on PeopleSoft support.  Release 7.5 has been unsupported since April 16, 2003.  This is also a release with a supported migration path to the Oracle Fusion Financial application.  In July 2008, the Oracle database release certified by PeopleSoft for the 7.5 release goes off support.  This will allow us to move to a certified Oracle database and other 3rd party software.  Migrating to this PeopleSoft release also gets KU to a release certified to work with the Microsoft Vista operating system (not being on the current release is holding up the move to Vista).  This will also allow KU to create a unified system of accounting and will help accommodate and promote a culture of financial and grants management at all levels.  The movement of our current financials and grants management system, to version 9.0, is critical to achieve this objective.  \*\* The KU detailed plan received CITO approval on 10/16/08.  KU reports that several things occurred that delayed the submittal of required documentation for CITO approval of this project.  Project delays were experienced during the planning and discovery phase of the project.  In addition, the project team proceeded with the construction/execution portion of the project unaware that necessary CITO approvals were not in place.  As a result, expenditures occurred which exceeded the $250,000 threshold prior to CITO approval.  In July of 2008, KU notified the CITO's office regarding leadership changes and identification of new project contacts.

**For the reporting period:**  PIER received with final costs reported.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KU PS Financials 9.0 (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Estimated Project Cost: | $432,568 | PIER Final Planning Cost: | $432,568 |
| External Cost: | $432,568 | External Cost to Date: | $432,568 |
| Estimated Start: | 7/07 | Estimated End: | 1/08 |

**Execution – Construction Phase - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **10/17/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$0** | **PIER Final Execution Costs:** | **$0** |
| **Execution Start:** | **2/4/08** | **Execution End:** | **10/13/08** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **10/3/08** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | PIER Final Close-Out Cost: | $0 |
| Estimated Start: | 10/08 | Estimated End: | 10/08 |

**Completed**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

## Legislative

**Conversion to Exchange Server 2007**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 11/20/08 | |
| Project Cost: | $281,332 | (Planning, execution and close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $70,500 | |

**I  +**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $277,612 | Execution Cost to Date: | $230,987 |
| Internal Cost: | $66,662 | Internal Cost to Date: | $34,305 |
| External Cost: | $210,950 | External Cost to Date: | $196,682 |
| Execution Start: | 11/10/08 | Execution End: | 6/9/09 |
| | | Adjusted Execution End: | 6/18/09 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

Funding Source for Project Cost        Vendor

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| State General Fund | 75% | Microsoft, AOS, Choice Solutions, DTS |
| Internal Costs | 25% | Solutions (Quest) |

**Completed-New**

The legislature is currently dependent on technology that has been twilighted in the Kansas Technical Architecture. An independent investigation by RTG Consulting, requested by the legislative leadership, documented user needs and explored various options, including a hosted email solution. Phase One will convert 50 selected legislators and staff to the new platform and support them through the 2009 legislative session. Phase Two will convert the remaining legislators and staff after the 2009 legislative session ends. Specific areas addressed in the project include: Email: The current Novell GroupWise email system will be converted to Exchange Server 2007. The email client will convert from GroupWise to Outlook. Calendar/Scheduling: The current GroupWise calendaring/scheduling will be converted to Exchange Server 2007 calendaring/scheduling. This will allow integration with third-party calendaring systems used by legislators and staff, including Google calendar. Spam Filtering: The legislature currently uses EFCOM anti-spam software. During November, 2008, we will convert to a Cisco IronPort anti-spam device for both the legacy GroupWise and the new Exchange Server email systems. Email Scripting Utility: The current Formativ scripting third-party utility will be converted to Email Merge Pro for Exchange Server 2007. Quest GroupWise Migrator: Quest GroupWise Migrator will be utilized throughout the migration. Instant Messaging: During the implementation of Phase Two, Groupwise Instant Messaging will be replaced by Windows Messaging. The hardware design assumes the legislature is purchasing a Storage Area Network (SAN) and this will be utilized for email storage during Phase Two.

**For the reporting period:** The migration from GroupWise to Exchange Server 2007 was completed 6/18/09 and the lessons learned meeting was held 6/26/09. OpenFire was implemented for instant messaging within the legislature, using the Spark client on the local machine. User acceptance was very high throughout the migration. The project completed on schedule and on budget. Project requirements associated with completed tasks have been met.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ◍ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Conversion to Exchange Server 2007 (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $3,120 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $3,120 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 10/08 | Estimated End: | 11/08 |

**Implementation - COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CITO Approval:** | **11/20/08** | | |
| **Execution Cost:** | **$277,612** | **Execution Cost to Date:** | **$230,987** |
| **Internal Cost:** | **$66,662** | **Internal Cost to Date:** | **$34,305** |
| **External Cost:** | **$210,950** | **External Cost to Date:** | **$196,682** |
| **Execution Start:** | **11/10/08** | **Execution End:** | **6/9/09** |
| | | **Adjusted Execution End:** | **6/18/09** |

Close-Out - **COMPLETED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $600 | | |
| Internal Cost: | $600 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 6/09 | Estimated End: | 6/09 |
| | | Adjusted Estimated End: | 7/09 |

**Completed-New**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## JUDICIAL BRANCH

### Judicial

**FullCourt Imaging**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Plan Approval | 10/4/06 | |
| CITO Detailed Plan Approval: | 2/15/07 | |
| Project Costs: | $818,000 | (Planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $30,000 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Execution Project Cost: | $818,000 | Execution Cost to Date: | $758,447 |
| Internal Cost: | $44,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $7,519 |
| External Cost: | $774,000 | External Cost to Date: | $750,928 |
| Execution Start: | 11/1/06 | Execution End: | 12/31/08 |
| | | PIER Received: | |

| Funding Source for Project Cost | | Vendor |
|---|---|---|
| Judiciary Technology Fund | 100% | Justice Systems, Inc |

**Completed**

This project includes the purchase of FullCourt Imaging Module (FIM) licenses for an additional integrated component of the Judicial Branch FullCourt Case Management System. This purchase entails 1,000+ licenses for current FullCourt users statewide. The FIM licenses will enable scanning and indexing of court documents. These documents are then integrated and accessible throughout the FullCourt Case Management System. Imaging is a first step towards Electronic Filing. Electronic filing will save time and increase efficiency. Storage space for paper documents will be reduced at this point. Local counties may be able to realize cost savings due to a decrease in storage space requirements. Savings may also be realized as the result of slower personnel growth due to increased efficiency.

**For the Reporting Period:** As of this reporting period, FullCourt imaging has been successfully installed in 26 of the 27 judicial districts originally scheduled for full implementation. The 18th judicial district, Sedgwick County, was originally scheduled for implementation as part of this project but has requested to be excluded due to local financial considerations. The 18th judicial district continues to express interest in installing FullCourt imaging, however potential installation dates fall well outside the schedule of the current project. Reviews of case management system changes with jurisdictions not participating in full implementation of the imaging component are complete. Project closeout activities are scheduled to begin in the next reporting period.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Full Court Imaging (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**
|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 4/06 | Estimated End: | 2/07 |

**Subproject I – Testing/Pilots - COMPLETED**
|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 2/15/07 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $784,000 | Execution Cost to Date: | $750,000 |
| Internal Cost: | $18,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $0 |
| External Cost: | $766,000 | External Cost to Date: | $750,000 |
| Execution Start: | 11/1/06 | Execution End: | 4/3/07 |

**Subproject II – Statewide Rollout - COMPLETED**
|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | 2/15/07 | | |
| Execution Cost: | $34,000 | Execution Cost to Date: | $8,447 |
| Internal Cost: | $26,000 | Internal Cost to Date: | $7,519 |
| External Cost: | $8,000 | External Cost to Date: | $928 |
| Execution Start: | 5/1/07 | Execution End: | 12/31/08 |

Close-Out **- COMPLETED**
|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| Estimated Project Cost: | $0 | | |
| Estimated Start: | 1/09 | Estimated End: | 1/09 |

**Completed**

| Symbol | Meaning | Symbol | Meaning |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        ✛   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## APPROVED PROJECTS SECTION

Approved Projects have received high-level CITO project plan approval as outlined in ITEC Policy 2400 r l  - Project Approval.  Projects are still in the planning phase and vendor selection.  Projects are not yet benchmarked for JCIT reporting. Percentage variances outlined in JCIT policy do not apply.

The estimated project cost and timeframes remain as *estimates* until they begin the Execution Phase.

## TERMS

Estimated Execution Start - This is the estimated start date on the current CITO approved high level plan    that "triggers" the

beginning of the execution phase.  The trigger date is an event (ie. hardware/software purchase and or installation, code development, etc).  This date remains an estimate until the execution phase begins.

Estimated Execution End -  This is the estimated end date on the current CITO approved high level plan.

Estimated Project Cost -    Estimated planning, execution and close out dollars of a project.

Estimated 3 Future Years
of Operational Cost -    Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed.

Funding Source for
Project Cost -    This item calls for identification of financing by percentage of funding source.

**Approved**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |
| **\*** | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | **+** | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## EXECUTIVE BRANCH

## Corporation Commission, Kansas (KCC)

**KCC Project 2010 BPI – Business Process Innovation and Improvement**

CITO High-Level Approval:              9/4/08
Estimated Project Cost:               $888,934    (Est. planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: $225,000
Estimated Execution Start:             8/1/09     Estimated Execution End:        10/1/10

Funding Source for Project Cost
Public Service Reg: Utilities Assessment    65%
Conservation Fee Fund: Oil & Gas Ind.       15%
Transport: Motor Carrier Fees               20%

The Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC) is embarking on a major project to improve the organization's business processes and technology.  The goal is to position KCC to more efficiently serve the public, regulate entities and other interests of the State of Kansas.  A number of our legacy technologies will be replaced or refreshed through this initiative, which will be accomplished through a firm/fixed price contract resulting from state issued RFP.  Most significantly, Oracle Forms technology is being sunset by the Oracle Corporation, and will no longer be supported in the coming years.   Through this project, we intend to replace the Oracle Forms-based technologies, with a more robust and flexible set of technologies which will be well supported into the coming decade.   While taking this opportunity to refresh the KCC technology architecture, there will be careful consideration of a number of viable industry-specific COTS (Commercial Off The Shelf) solutions or frameworks in use by other state agencies in Kansas, which have been successfully implemented by other state government Public Utility Service Regulatory Commissions.  KCC embraces an atmosphere of continual Business Process Innovation and Improvement (BPI), and has identified a number of inter-related business initiatives, aligned with the Kansas Strategic Information Management (SIM) Plan for 2008-2013 and to be delivered in a carefully orchestrated series of inter-related initiatives, by 2010.   When realized, these initiatives will significantly improve efficiency, streamline operations, reduce costs, retain valuable institutional knowledge, and improve customer service.  Project 2010 BPI is included in KCC's 3-Year Information Technology Management and Budget Plan.  KCC's Vision Statement for this project is as follows:  Through Project 2010 BPI, KCC will pioneer innovative business processes, established upon a foundation of modern information technology architectures, and designed to effectively and efficiently service KCC partners and customers for the foreseeable future.  Project Goals Include:  1) Establish and support an enabling Enterprise Architecture (EA) foundation for management of agency structured and unstructured information through thoughtful application of modernized database management, document management, and workflow management technologies. 2) Enhanced E-Filing processes for Annual Reports, review cycles, and assessments, 3) Replacement of legacy Docketing System with a modernized Docket/Case/Matter Management System framework, 4) Replacement of current manual and legacy automated systems which support the Issuance, Renewal, and Auditing of Transportation Authorities.

**For the Reporting Period**:  On 6/04/09 the KCC selected **ACO Information Services, LLC** out of the three vendors that were selected for on-site demonstrations. The KCC and ACO will create a detailed project plan for CITO approval in July. The project implementation phase is expected to begin the first week of August and last approximately 14 months.

*Approved*

😊  Meeting targeted goals.

🔴  Project Stopped/Canceled.

⭐  Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I**  Infrastructure Project

P  Project completed and PIER received

**C**  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A**  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

▽  Project on hold.

⊕  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

◍  Reporting insufficient.

*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Historical Society, State

### Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Approval: | 5/14/09 | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $718,436 | (Est. planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $225,000 | |
| Estimated Execution Start: | 11/30/09 | Estimated Execution End:          9/7/10 |

Funding Source for Project Cost

| | |
|---|---|
| State General Fund | 55% |
| INK Grant | 24% |
| Pending – National Digital Information And Preservation Program – Library of Congress | 21% |

The objective of the Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) Archives project is to design, build, test, and deploy a trusted digital repository to allow Kansas citizens to preserve and access electronic government records with enduring value.  The Kansas State Historical Society, through the Government Records Preservation Act (KSA 45-401 through 45-413), has statutory responsibility to serve as the official archives for the state of Kansas and to undertake records management activities.  All state agencies are also subject to this law.  HB 2195 establishes the State Archivist as a certifying authority for agency records processed and stored in an enterprise digital archive.  In project plan filings with the EPMO agencies are requesting KSHS accept their digital material and archive it for them.  However, the transition from a paper-based to a digital archive is extremely challenging.  This project would assist the Society and state government meet these statutory responsibilities as they apply to electronic records.

**For the Reporting Period**:  The High-Level Project Plan was submitted and received CITO approval 5/14/09. Currently the development team is finalizing a Request for Proposal to solicit a vendor for the project.  The scope of the RFP includes:

- Assist the project development team on developing the detailed project plan
- Assist the Kansas State Historical Society staff in developing a policy framework for the KEEP archives, including a funding stream
- Functional and Technical requirements gathering
- Fit/gap analysis of the requirements against the vendor's current product line
- System design including  use cases and documented business processes
- System build to include:
  - o   Material ingestion into the archives from state agencies
  - o  OAIS compliant system repository
  - o  Search and retrieval methods for both agency staff and public access
  - o  Verify digital records retrieved from the content owners' websites against the archived copy for authenticity and accuracy
  - o  Provide for certification of digital material by the State Archivist
  - o  Interface to Kansas.gov's payment engine to process payments and distribute to appropriate state accounts
- Testing and quality assurance of the KEEP Archives system

It is expected that 80% - 85% of the KEEP Archives system requirements will be represented in the vendor's current product line and 15% - 20% of the requirements will require customization of the current product line.  The RFP will be released by Friday, 7/17/09.  The Division of Purchasing is assisting the development team with the RFP.

*Approved-New*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🥟 | Reporting insufficient. |
| ＊ *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | | ✛ | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)

### Central Message Switch (CMS) Replacement Project

CITO High-Level Approval:                2/26/09
Estimated Project Cost:                  $605,200        (Est. planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:   $247,556
Estimated Execution Start:               7/1/10       Estimated Execution End:        7/30/11

Funding Source for Project Cost
State General Fund                       52%
Fee Fund                                 48%

On 3/9/98 the current Kansas Central Message Switch (CMS) was installed to replace the ASTRA switch/SNA network. This created an instant link with criminal records at the local, state and national levels as part of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) 2000 initiative. KCJIS information is maintained in numerous Kansas databases, other states' criminal justice databases, as well as federal databases which allow Kansas law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies timely access to critical information in order to provide public safety. The CMS is interfaced with these various networks and databases to supply this information. Since P4's bankruptcy, the CMS code and interfaces have been supported by Balance Wheel Technologies, Inc., contracted to the KBI. While Balance Wheel Technologies, Inc., has done a commendable job in maintaining the current switch, it is still a one-man shop leaving the KBI vulnerable to non-support of a critical information system should the current avenue of support become no longer available. Furthermore, the current CMS code limits the KBI's use of current technologies such as XML and web-services, not allowing the KBI to receive grant monies for participation in national information sharing initiatives such as the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS) National Interstate Sharing of Photo's (NISP) and Criminal History Information Exchange Format (CHIEF) projects and become fully compliant with the NCIC (National Crime Information Center) CJIS Security Policy and NCIC 2000 project. It is not cost effective to upgrade the current 10 year old CMS to be able to utilize current technologies.

**For the Reporting Period**: Due to another budget cut request by the governor we offered to return the CMS replacement money in lieu of cutting another 2% from our FY 10 budget. We currently have a request in for grant funding of the CMS Replacement Project but we do not have a firm date of when we can expect a response back from our request. As of today the CMS replacement project is on permanent hold until funding can be found.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA)

### Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite

CITO High-Level Approval:                 2/21/08
Estimated Project Cost:                   $1,392,044          (Est. planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:    $246,584
Estimated Execution Start:                10/1/09             Estimated Execution End:        6/1/11


Funding Source for Project Cost
State General Fund                        100%


The Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority (KSJJA) uses four main applications when it comes to tracking and documenting youth in our system. These applications are the Juvenile Justice Intake and Assessment Management System (JJIAMS), the Juvenile Correctional Facility System (JCFS), the Community Agency Supervision Information Management System (CASIMS) and the Purchase of Services Management database (POSsuM). Each of these applications are reaching the end of life or twilight stage necessitating a single replacement application to incorporate all functionality of current applications for the capture of youth's information. The project will require input from state, county and local entities and in coordination with Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS). The completed re-write of the JJIS application will incorporate the four above mentioned end of life applications. The current applications will continue to be maintained and updated until a time at which the new application has been thoroughly tested and completed.
**For the Reporting Period**: The project is currently in vendor negotiations.

*Approved*

## Labor, Department of (KDOL)

### UIM Build and Deploy – Please see Active Section

| Symbol | Meaning | Symbol | Meaning |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🥚 | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***    *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    **+**    Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Department of (KDOR)

**DMV Modernization – (Formerly - Project 2010 Division of Vehicle Modernization)**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval:          6/21/07
Estimated Project Cost:                      $40,155,966          (Est. planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: $5,508,336
Estimated Execution Start:                  8/6/09          Estimated Execution End:          6/29/12

Funding Source for Project Cost
Vehicle Operating Fund                     16%
To Be Determined                             84%

The Vehicle Information Processing System (VIPS) main functions are to process vehicle registration, title, license plate and permit transactions as well as the collection of fees for all 2.7 million registered vehicles. The VIPS system is responsible for maintaining title and registration records for use by law enforcement and other motor vehicle agencies. The Division of Vehicles partners with all 105 County Treasurers to provide vehicle services to the citizens of Kansas. The current VIPS system was implemented in December 1987. Problems exist with the upload and download batch processes to the counties. The system lacks real time capabilities, which leads to delays of up to several days in receiving current registration information. The goal of DMV Modernization (Formerly Project 2010 Division of Vehicle Modernization) will be an integrated Titles and Registration, Inventory, Driver Control and Driver's Licensing system. The results of the feasibility study will determine the scope of the project to replace Vehicle Information Processing System (VIPS), Kansas Driver License System (KDLS) and Kansas Vehicle Inventory System (KVIS). The project plans for DMV Modernization (Formerly Project 2010 Division of Vehicle Modernization) will be submitted for approvals and included in the budget after the feasibility study is completed. This project is the implementation piece as discussed in the DMV Modernization (Formerly Project 2010 Division of Vehicle Modernization) Vehicle Information Processing System (VIPS) Replacement Feasibility Project.

**For the reporting period:** The DMV Project Team has completed the Request for Proposal/Evaluation and contract negotiation process. A letter of intent was signed on 6/22/09 and the contract with 3M was signed on 7/1/09. The DMV Modernization Project is in the Planning Phase and work is concentrated on developing the Detailed Project Plan for approval by CITO. The DMV Modernization Project Team and all stakeholders look forward to moving forward with this project.

**Approved**

| | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** | Project completed and PIER received | | Reporting insufficient. |
| **\*** | *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | **+** | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)

### KDOT Construction Management System Integration with IBM Expediter Project

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:            6/25/09
Estimated Project Cost:                 $331,222      (Est. planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:  $120,000
Estimated Execution Start:              7/20/09    Estimated Execution End:        12/10/09

Funding Source for Project Cost
State Highway Fund                       100%

The Construction Management System consists of a Contract Management System and Materials Test System. The Kansas Department of Transportation uses this system to pay contractors, change the terms of the contract, approve subcontractors, final contracts, sample tracking and reporting, test result reporting, record Bituminous/HMA and PC Concrete plant production and handles the Inspector Witness program.   CMS provides detailed information to KDOT Comprehensive Project Management System.  CMS sends payment vouchers to KDOT Voucher Entry System.  Currently, to install CMS you must load DB2, Java and the CMS Java folder. Then you apply the latest application release. If you have a standalone system you must sync DB2 on the local PC with DB2 on the mainframe. The install consists of downloading all data from 11 different DB2 tables so the data can be accessed in a disconnected mode.  DB2 Personal Edition 8.3 will not be supported as of April, 2009. DB2 Personal Edition will have to be upgraded. Another consideration is each of the 31 construction offices as well as the Bureau of Construction and Maintenance and the Bureau of Fiscal Services spends one day loading on software for each release.   There is a CMS release about every quarter. KDOT replaces 1/3 of their desktops and laptops each year. KDOT also installs CMS on consultant laptops when ever required. The District Techs spend approximately 450 hours a year installing CMS.   The Construction Offices' spend approximately 550 additional hours each year installing CMS. The Construction Offices' also spend approximately 250 hours each quarter installing releases.   The total of all hours for new installations and release installations of the current CMS is approximately 2,000 hours per year.   The typical wage, with benefits, for the staff that do this work is $50 per hour.  Expeditor can push application upgrades and changes to the client. By Expeditor doing the upgrades the User will not need to know which file goes into which folder.   When CMS is loaded you will load Expeditor only. You will not have to load DB2, Java and then the application.  Expeditor will automatically synchronize through the server. The synchronization process is different so there should be some time savings on the synchronization process.  Upgrades to DB2, Java, integrating CMS into IBM Expeditor and Data migration will be performed.

**For the Reporting Period**:  The Detailed Plan Approval was submitted and received CITO approval on 6/25/09.

*Approved-New*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## REGENTS

### Emporia State University

**Banner Enrollment Management Suite Implementation Project**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO High-Level Approval: | 12/15/08 | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $519,874 | (Est. planning, execution and closeout) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: | $124,864 | |
| Estimated Execution Start: | 8/10/09 | Estimated Execution End: 1/4/10 |

Funding Source for Project Cost

| | |
|---|---|
| State General Fund | 10% |
| Restrictive Fees | 90% |

The successful management of both prospective and existing student relationships is fundamental to the mission of Emporia State University (ESU). Competition for students between institutions of higher education continues to increase along with the demand for real-time data and information access to support the strategic enrollment management efforts of ESU. Emporia State University plans to implement the Sungard Higher Education Banner Enrollment Management Suite, a recruitment and admissions system tightly integrated into the University's Banner ERP system, to improve University enrollment management processes and access to strategic decision support information assets.

**For the Reporting Period**:    The Banner Enrollment Management Suite Implementation project is currently on schedule and under budget.  The project schedule has been defined, and external resources have been secured. Detailed planning and discovery activities are in progress in preparation for successful project execution. Test environments have been established and are currently being utilized to define detailed communications, expressions, population lists, campaigns, prospective student portal content and performance metrics/reports for deployment during project execution.

**Approved**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

# PLANNED PROJECTS SECTION

Planned projects are in the conceptual stage and have estimated costs and timeframes.  The project estimates listed are rough estimates and are not yet benchmarked for JCIT reporting.  Percentage variances outlined in JCIT policy do not apply.

When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.  Projects remain in the Planned Projects section until the agency decides whether or not to more forward with the project.

Approximately 95% of the projects in this section are identified in the agencies annual 3 - Year IT Management and Budget Plans, which a part of includes current and three years of long range planning for IT projects, in accordance with K.S.A 75-7210.  The other 5% are disclosed through the Division of Purchases, INK, Specifications, Agency notification, etc.

# TERMS

Estimated Planning Start - Estimated planning start date for an identified Planned Project.

Estimated Closeout End -  Estimated planning end date for an identified Planned Project.

Estimated Project Cost -   Estimated planning, execution and close out dollars of a project.

Estimated 3 Future Years
of Operational Cost -         Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project Operational Cost is completed.

CITO Project
Notification -                    The date the CITO issues a determination letter to the agency stating an IT effort is a CITO reportable project.

Anticipated Funding
Source for Project Cost -   This item calls for identification for forecasted financing by percentage of funding source.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |
| * *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* | | + | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

## PLANNED PROJECTS
### EXECUTIVE BRANCH

## Corrections, Kansas Department of (KDOC)
### Total Offender Activity and Document System/Offender Management Information System (TOADS/OMIS) Replacement

CITO Approval:                              Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                     To Be Determined  (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:     To Be Determined
Estimated Planning Start:                   To Be Determined    Est Close-Out End:  To Be Determined
                                                                CITO Proj Notification:        11/5/07
                                                                Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
                                                                  Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
State General Fund
Grant Funding

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The present offender management information system that KDOC uses does not support the accessibility, ad hoc reporting, and data analysis ability that is required by the users.  KDOC information technology staff are trying to maintain two different antiquated information systems written in RPG III, COBOL S36, and Lotus Notes.  The objective of this project is to create one offender information management system that is browser based to be used by the KS Department of Corrections, Kansas Parole Board, and Community Corrections agencies.  The new system will support the Department's risk reduction case planning initiative with information sharing among state agencies, local community providers, and law enforcement.

**E-Government:**  Today our current offender information system is a closed system.  Included in the plan for the new system will be an information sharing piece with local agencies.

**Technical Architecture:**  The new offender information system will be a browser based system written in either a J2EE or .Net framework.  KDOC will follow the industry and state standards on server architecture.  We will be moving away from the proprietary IBM iSeries.  The database technology will be driven by the software selection.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The stakeholders included in the scope of this project are the Kansas Department of Corrections, Kansas Parole Board, Kansas Sentencing Commission, Attorney Generals office, Governor's office, all Community Corrections agencies, Kansas Bureau of Investigation, local services agencies, local law enforcement agencies, and the general public.  The goal of the system is to track information on offenders beginning with Community Corrections process through incarceration and until

**Planned**

| | |
|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C**  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A**  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽  Project on hold. |
| **I**  Infrastructure Project | ⊕  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P  Project completed and PIER received | ⬭  Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Corrections, Kansas Department of (KDOC) (Continued)
### Total Offender Activity and Document System/Offender Management Information System (TOADS/OMIS) Replacement (Continued)

discharge from post incarceration supervision. This system will also meet the requirements for the Association of State Correctional Administrators and National Adult Compact Information System while meeting the KDOC goal of risk reduction offender case management.

**Project Status:** Today KDOC is exploring different software solutions: purchasing a package or creating a system from scratch. We have reviewed four purchased packages and the package from the National Consortium. We are also exploring training options for Information Technology staff, and exploring obtaining consultant services for architectural analysis, project management facilitation, and facilitation for gathering the system requirements.

**Planned**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Education, Kansas State Department of (KSDE)
### Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation

CITO Approval:                              Not Yet Requested
   Estimated Project Cost:            $1,833,912** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
   Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: $1,426,410**
   Estimated Planning Start:          7/1/09          Est. Close-Out End:        6/30/2012
                                                    CITO Proj Notification:    5/21/09
                                                    Identified by Agency

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
National Institute of Education Sciences Grant  100%

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  KSDE proposes a three-year project to implement electronic transcripts for all K-12 districts in the state.  This will include electronic exchange of transcripts as students move between K-12 districts, electronic transfer of transcripts from K-12 districts to postsecondary institutions and an annual upload of high school transcript data to the Kansas State Department of Education.

Currently, districts must manually request and send transcripts when students move between districts.  In addition, parents and students must manually submit and track transcripts requests from K-12 schools to postsecondary institutions. This is a time- and resource-consuming task that often is not done in a timely manner, resulting in students being inappropriately enrolled in courses, delays and inaccuracies in the effective progress towards the students' education goals, and undue burden to parents as well as school district and postsecondary institution personnel.  In addition, this manual and paper-intensive process can result in security risks for confidential student information.

The Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation initiative will provide the ability to efficiently, reliably, and securely capture and deliver electronic student academic records across districts, from districts to the state, and between school districts and postsecondary systems.  This can reduce burden related to admission and guidance activities, eliminate the security risks associated with manual and paper processes, increase the accuracy and effectiveness of the data, and ensure that students receive the services they need in a timely manner.   In addition the annual feed of student course data will enable efficient and reliable interoperability between district data systems and KSDE for reporting high school course completion data.

Over the past two years KSDE has collaborated with Missouri and Nebraska State Departments of Education in evaluating e-Transcript solutions and selected Docufide, Inc. as the preferred vendor.  Selection criteria included costs to the state, districts, and students; ability to include Kansas State Student Identifier; architectural flexibility and ability to utilize a variety of formats; ability to work with multiple student information system vendors; reporting features; ease of use and flexibility of implementation for districts;

**Planned-New**

| | |
|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Education, Kansas State Department of (KSDE) (Continued)
### Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation (Continued)

Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and standards compliance (School Interoperability Framework (SIF), Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC), 508 Accessibility); and ability to send records between K-12 schools, to postsecondary institutions, and to the state department of education. In addition, the Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC) conducted the RFP process for member states, and so an additional RFP is not needed to begin work with Docufide. MHEC member states include Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

**E-Government:** Once implemented, Kansas e-Transcripts will offer parents and school districts the ability to submit and process student transcript requests online. This will greatly enhance the ease of use, ability to track, and timeliness of transcript processing for Kansas residents. Using a simple browser interface, parents / students will be able to enter and submit transcript requests when students move between school districts, and when student apply to public and private postsecondary institutions. School districts can reliably and securely process the requests electronically to the selected destinations. School districts and postsecondary institutions will electronically receive the transcript information in their preferred format. These services will be provided free of charge to parents, school districts, and postsecondary institutions when movement is within Kansas or to postsecondary institutions within the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC).

This initiative also includes the electronic capture and upload of student course completion data to KSDE, providing efficient, reliable, and secure interoperability between school district data systems and KSDE.

**Technical Architecture:** This e-Transcript implementation will utilize Docufide's Secure Transcript™ solution, which is a web-based application that has been designed to be secure and highly scalable. The primary interfaces and functionality provided by the application include:
- Student web interface – students can register, order transcripts, and check order status using a standard web browser.
- Member administrative web interface
  - Sending functionality: School administrators from sending institutions (school districts) can review and approve student orders and access activity reports using a standard web browser.
  - Receiving functionality: Schools and postsecondary institutions can use a standard web browser to receive transcripts electronically, download student records, access reports, and obtain information about sending schools.
  - Requesting functionality: School districts and postsecondary institutions can use a standard web browser to order transcripts to be sent to or from their school.
- Secure Data Link for student record transmission – The Secure Transcript Client application uses a secure internet link to send student transcript data from the sending institution to Docfide's Secure Transcript Server using a client-server secure architecture.
- Docufide Transcript Print Services – If the receiving institution cannot receive electronic transcripts, Docufide's Transcript Print Services will send the transcript by mail.

*Planned-New*

| Symbol | Meaning | | Symbol | Meaning |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☺ | Meeting targeted goals. | | C | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| ⬤ | Project Stopped/Canceled. | | A | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ★ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| I | Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | | ◉ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Education, Kansas State Department of (KSDE) (Continued)
### Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation (Continued)

**Project Description and Scope:**  KSDE will work with Docufide, Inc to implement electronic transcripts free of charge for all students in public and private K-12 districts in the state for exchange between K-12 districts, and from K-12 to postsecondary institutions within Kansas as well as MHEC member states.

- K-12 students and parents will be able to use standard web browsers to request sending of electronic transcripts to other school districts, and to track the progress of the transcript requests.
- K-12 school administrators will be able to review and approve student transcript send requests, and can access reports of transcript send and receipt activity for their districts.
- High school (9-12) students and parents will be able to use standard web browsers to request sending of electronic transcripts to postsecondary institutions in Kansas, as well as to other MHEC states, at no cost; and to postsecondary institutions in other states for a minimal fee.  In addition they will be able to track the progress of the transcript request online.
- Kansas postsecondary institutions will be able to receive transcripts online and download student data in their preferred format.  They will be able to access reports to review transcript activity online.

In addition the project will include an annual upload of transcript data (starting in the second year of the project) to KSDE for students in grades 9-12.  This will provide efficient interoperability between district student information systems and KSDE for uploading student course enrollment and course completion data.

This implementation is funded by a three year grant to the Kansas State Department of Education from the national Institute of Education Sciences, and the functionality will be provided at no charge to students, parents, school districts, or postsecondary institutions.  During the three years KSDE will convene an e-Transcript Advisory Council consisting of K-12 and Postsecondary representatives.  The Advisory Council will assist in determining the content and layout of the transcripts, advocate for adoption by all K-12 districts, and develop a plan for on-going sustainability of Kansas e-Transcripts past the three year grant.

**Project Status:**  KSDE has been awarded a grant from the national Institute of Education Sciences which includes funds for this three year implementation project, and the Kansas Board of Education has approved of the initiative. We currently are working with Docufide, Inc. to finalize the high level project plan.

**Planned-New**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Health and Environment, Kansas Department of (KDHE)
### Laboratory Information Management System

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $1,400,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) | | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | To Be Determined | | |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 7/1/10 | Est. Close-Out End: | 6/30/13 |
| | | CITO Proj Notification: | 10/17/08 |
| | | Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans | |

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The primary goal of this project is to replace an outdated and difficult to maintain Informix LIMS (paper workbooks, paper log sheets, and Excel files used for the record keeping system) with a web-based LIMS. The LIMS will need to store data in an Oracle database. The system will need to allow entry, viewing, printing and exporting of clinical data. The LIMS will need to be capable of storing all data contained in the current database. The system will also be required to interface with the current laboratory instruments. Additionally, the implemented solution must address the workflow needs within the Health and Environment: laboratory test processing (clinical and environmental); test scheduling; proactive specimen/sample collection (prescheduled tests); specimen and sample tracking/chain of custody; media, reagent, stains, controls, manufacturing; inventory control including kits and forms management, general laboratory reporting that meets HL7 guidelines; quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) management; statistical analysis and surveillance; ability to bill for laboratory services; capture electronic documents and save copies to the ImageNow DMS; interface with the CDC database; and provide electronic data exchange (HL7).

**E-Government:** User access, security and administration would be compliant with all aspects of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA information: http://www.cms.hhs.gov/HIPAAGenInfo/, and the Center for Disease Control (CDC).

**Technical Architecture:** The LIMS will utilize the Microsoft .Net Framework 3 tier architecture, an Internet browser front-end for accessing the system externally, existing KDHE security log-in authentication, a public faced web server, and an application and database server behind a DMZ.

**Project Description and Scope:** The Kansas Department of Health and Environment, will solicit proposals to provide for the purchase and support of technical assistance in planning, developing, implementation and support of a comprehensive, integrated web-based solution to address the information management and electronic communication needs of a LIMS. The implemented solution must enable Kansas physicians and other healthcare providers to order tests and specimen examinations over the Internet as well as receive the results over the Internet.

**Project Status:** This project is currently being reviewed. Additional information will be needed prior to submitting a request for approval to the CITO.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.* ✛ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Published: August 2009

## Health Policy Authority, Kansas (KHPA)
### Eligibility/Enrollment System

CITO Approval:                    Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:           $15,000,000-$20,000,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: $6,000,000**
Estimated Planning Start:         To Be Determined  Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
                                                    CITO Proj Notification:        10/22/07
                                                    Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
                                                      Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**   To implement a more flexible and maintainable eligibility system, utilizing current technology to meet current needs and those of future Health Care Reform initiatives.

**E-Government:**  The system should have the capability to streamline the process for Kansas citizens to apply for medical benefits.

**Technical Architecture:**  Web based relational data base desired.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The system will be used extensively by KHPA staff to manage all aspects of the application and tracking process related to Medicaid eligibility and state employee health insurance membership management.  It should also provide better access to information for Kansas residents and other State agencies involved in these processes.

**Project Status:**  The project has not started.  Planning may start in FY2008, and KHPA is anticipating a minimum of 18 months for implementation.  KHPA and SRS will collaborate on this project and the two agencies will jointly submit Project Plans involving the eligibility/enrollment system for CITO approval.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Health Policy Authority, Kansas (KHPA) (Continued)
### Health Information Exchange

CITO Approval:                          Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                 $250,000-$500,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: $300,000**
Estimated Planning Start:               To Be Determined  Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
                                                          CITO Proj Notification:      10/22/07
                                                          Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
                                                            Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  To direct and/or participate in State and federal initiatives to improve health care related processes and outcomes via electronic exchange of information.

**Technical Architecture:**  Conform to national standards for format and content of records allowing data from disparate systems to be shared.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The goal is to make various health care information available to care providers, payers, and beneficiaries to improve access, outcomes, and administrative processes in the health care arena.

**Project Status:**  KHPA is participating in a pilot project in Sedgwick County.  Future efforts are not fully defined as of now.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✚  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Highway Patrol, Kansas (KHP)
### E-Citation – TRCC and KCJIS

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $1,443,400** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $300,000** |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 7/07 |

Estimated Close-Out End:     5/10
CITO Proj Notification:     9/28/06
Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
   Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
National Highway Traffic Safety
   Administration (TRCC)          100%

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The purpose of adopting a statewide electronic Uniform Traffic Citation (UTC) is to create a standard data set to be collected by law enforcement for all citations issued in the state of Kansas.  The development of a UTC will facilitate the development of a statewide traffic citations repository.  The purpose of a Statewide Citation Repository is to provide issuance-to-resolution tracking of citations issued throughout the state of Kansas in order to facilitate statistical reporting on a regional or statewide basis.  The repository will also allow law enforcement agencies to identify opportunities associated with the issuance of, or corrective measures taken for, traffic citations issued in Kansas.

**E-Government:**  The project will enable law enforcement officials to download forms, input data and issue citations electronically.  All citations will be maintained in a statewide citations repository, allowing online access to data for purposes of statistical analysis and reporting by multiple state agencies.

**Technical Architecture:**  Decisions regarding technical architecture for the E-Citations project are dependent on the solution selected in the TRCC-FBR project and the results of requirement gathering.  New infrastructure including both hardware and software will be required to support this project.

**Project Description and Scope:**  KHP will lead the project, with funding from the Kansas Legislature and participation by local law enforcement agencies, KDOT, and OJA IT staff.  The project team will gather requirements for a Uniform Traffic Citation from law enforcement agencies and develop a draft UTC.  KHP will develop the repository solution and contract for services.  After testing and revision, the team will distribute the UTC to law enforcement agencies.  This is a Traffic Record Coordinating Committee project.

**Project Status:**  The project is in the pre-planning stages.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)
### Kansas Incident Based Reporting Replacement

CITO Approval:                                    Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                           $625,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: $225,000**
Estimated Planning Start:                7/08              Est. Close-Out End:To Be Determined
                                                           CITO Proj Notification:      9/24/07
                                                           Identified by Agency IT Mgmt. &
                                                            Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  An aged KIBRS system no longer supports the needs of local law enforcement nor state and federal agencies requiring incident data.  The existing system does not provide timely nor accurate data and is not sufficiently extensible to meet the needs of new collaborative efforts such as N-Dex.  The system must be replaced.

**E-Government:**  Through the use the Internet and electronic communications the KIBRS system will collect comprehensive incident and arrest data that is essential for a comprehensive Central Criminal History Repository.  The Criminal History Repository provides timely information to criminal history agencies across the nation.  But only when it is coupled with timely incident and intelligence data can it realize its value as an investigative and crime analysis tool.

**Technical Architecture:**  The project will move the state and the Criminal History Repository forward dramatically in the areas of Service Oriented Architecture and the adoption of robust XML technologies.  It will place Kansas at the leading edge of state Criminal History Repositories and crime analysis capabilities.

**Project Description and Scope:**  All criminal justice agencies in the state of Kansas will have access to new, reliable incident information for crime reporting and analysis.  All agencies with directly programmed connections to the existing KIBRS system will be directly affected.

**Project Status:**  A need analysis has been funded and is expected to complete in late FY08.  Specific funding needs and timelines for developing the replacement system will be an outcome of the needs analysis.  The agency has dedicated $250,000 to go towards the completion of the project and will be seeking additional funding as indicated by the needs analysis.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Pharmacy, Kansas Board of (KHP)
### Kansas Board of Pharmacy Licensing, Inspection & Disciplinary Software

CITO Approval:                          Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                 $255,000 - 370,000**  (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: $50,000**
Estimated Planning Start:               6/09            Est. Close-Out End:        6/10
                                                        CITO Proj Notification:    4/2/09
                                                        Identified by Agency

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
Encumbered Funds                        To Be Determined
Pharmacy Fee Fund                       To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  Proposed technology is intended to streamline the day to day operations of the Board of Pharmacy, opening the lines of communication between field and office staff and the entire Board of Pharmacy staff and consumers.  We currently use three different systems in order to perform daily licensing, inspection, and compliance functions, which are not compatible with one another.  With new software, we can combine these functions into one program.  We are also attempting to transition to a paperless office in order to better serve the citizens of Kansas and allow more efficient work processes.

**E-Government:**  The project will allow for 24/7 citizen access which will provide all citizens, businesses, and government entities equal and efficient electronic access.  They will be able to apply and renew online for licenses and registrations, stay up to date on the progress of their applications, verify licenses more easily to ensure patient safety and also submit complaint forms for a more expedient and efficient investigative process.  It is our belief that utilizing new software will allow for advanced electronic forms where the entire application and renewal process can be completed and submitted online along with the payment.  Forms can also be downloaded, printed and sent through conventional means to serve those consumers and applicants who aren't able to and aren't comfortable with completing forms and applications electronically.

**Technical Architecture:**  The software that the Board is intending to implement can be used in any other agency that involves licensing, field work, and enforcement.  The software is designed primarily

**Planned-New**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Pharmacy, Kansas Board of (KHP) (Continued)
### Kansas Board of Pharmacy Licensing, Inspection & Disciplinary Software (Continued)

for use by government agencies and, once installed, must allow any modifications necessary to be performed by the end user including new business rules and fields without any software code or table structure modifications.  Further, the software must run on current versions of Microsoft SQL and Microsoft workstation products.

**Project Description and Scope:**  Within the Kansas Board of Pharmacy, this software will improve and streamline the licensing and enforcement ability of the Board.  It will also improve the ability of field inspectors to accurately conduct inspections on-site and to quickly return that information to the Topeka office.  In performing these functions, the software will better serve the citizens of Kansas as well of those outside of Kansas who use the services of Kansas licensed pharmacies, pharmacists, distributors, and other Kansas Board of Pharmacy licensed and registered entities.

**Project Status:**     The Board of Pharmacy is experiencing difficulties due to most recent budget cuts.  Funds previously allocated to the project are being used for other agency items.  Our planned project's Request for Proposal will not change, however the timeline for any software purchases is currently affected and delayed.

**Planned-New**

**Return to Index**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| **P** Project completed and PIER received | | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Racing and Gaming, Kansas
### Financial Reporting System

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $330,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $15,000** |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 9/1/08 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Est. Close-Out End: | 12/1/08 |
| CITO Proj Notification: | 7/17/08 |
| Identified by Agency | |

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Fund        80%
Racing Fund                                 20%

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  This project will be undertaken by KRGC staff working with Gaming Laboratories International to complete a system to allow independent gathering of financial data from the casinos.

Data will be entered by both Casino personnel and KRGC staff on a real time basis.  Auditing of the data will be accomplished by KRGC staff.  Casinos and KRGC staff will have tools to access services and data with a high level of security and reliability.

**Technical Architecture**:  The project implements using Microsoft Sequel Server technologies.

**Project Status**:  The project is currently in the planning stage.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Racing and Gaming, Kansas (Continued)
### Integrated Regulatory Information System

CITO Approval:                              Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                     $250,000**  (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: $110,000**
Estimated Planning Start:                   9/1/08              Est. Close-Out End:        12/1/08
                                                                CITO Proj Notification:    7/18/08
                                                                Identified by Agency

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Fund        80%
Racing Fund                                 20%

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  This project will be undertaken by KRGC staff working with Gaming Informatics to complete a system to allow independent gathering of financial data and to maintain an inventory of electronic gaming machines and their status.

Data will be entered by both Casino personnel and KRGC staff on a real time basis.  Auditing of the date will be accomplished by KRGC staff.  Casinos and KRGC staff will have tools to access services and data with a high level of security and reliability.

**Technical Architecture**:  The project implements using Microsoft Sequel Server technologies.

**Project Status**:  The project is currently in the planning stage.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🏉 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Racing and Gaming, Kansas (Continued)
### Kansas Expanded Lottery Act - Casino Infrastructure

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $751,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $261,000** |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 4/1/09 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Est. Close-Out End: | 12/10 |
| CITO Proj Notification: | 7/1/08 |
| Identified by Agency | |

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

| | |
|---|---|
| Expanded Lottery Act Regulation Fund | 80% |
| Racing Fund | 20% |

**** The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  This project will be undertaken by KRGC staff, working with the Kansas Lottery and DISC to install telecommunication lines, computer hardware and software and other equipment needed in the 4 Kansas Casinos to meet the statutory requirements set out in the Kansas Expanded Lottery Act (2007 Senate Bill 66).

**E-Government**:  This project will use the new racing and gaming licensing system allowing staff to access gaming and racing licenses, case tracking, and law enforcement data on a real time basis. Casinos will have the tools to access services directly from the KRGC offices providing for high levels of security and reliability.

**Technical Architecture**:  This project implements a web-based user interface using Microsoft Sequel Server technologies.

**Project Status**:  The project is currently in the planning stage.

**Planned**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🥏 | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS)
**Active Workflow**

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $775,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $30,000** |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 7/1/10 |

Est. Close-Out End:         7/1/12
CITO Proj Notification:    9/25/08
Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
   Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
KPERS Fund                          To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  This project will be designed to improve and enhance customer service by tracking applications from receipt through final action.

**E-Government:**  N/A

**Technical Architecture**:  Active workflow will be built utilizing KITS architecture using an n-tier application architecture that allows software developers to create flexible and reusable software. In n-tier architecture, the entire application is divided into several pieces. These pieces can be logical or physical. Each piece performs a specific task such as displaying user interface or data access. There can be any number of layers of such pieces.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The intent of the Active Workflow project is to improve the efficiency of several key KPERS business processes through the use of rules-based work routing and work processing. There are ten key business processes that will be re-evaluated and reengineered for efficiencies. The system will provide the ability to distribute work based on defined triggering events and unique conditions from the following sources:
- Imaging and Indexing system
- Employer Self Service Web Portal
- Member Self Service Web Portal
- KPERS Internal KITS system

The system will also provide workflow management reporting.

**Project Status:**  Planning Phase

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🥏 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS) (Continued)
### KITS – Financial Management System Interfaces/Lawson Functionality

CITO Approval:                          Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                 To Be Determined  (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined
Estimated Planning Start:               1/1/09              Est. Close-Out End:         7/1/10
                                                            CITO Proj Notification:    9/25/08
                                                            Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
                                                              Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
KPERS Fund                              To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The States FMS project may require minor or major modifications to KITS in order to maintain the exchange of information and the processing of benefit payments. Depending upon the functionality available in the States new FMS It may be necessary for KPERS to replace the functionality currently provided by the LAWSON software.

**E-Governmen**t:  N/A

**Technical Architecture**:  Any changes or new system will comply with the Kansas Information Technology Architecture Standards

**Project Description and Scope:**  Cannot be determined until specifications are available from the FMS vendor.

**Project Status:**  Hold

**Planned**

😊  Meeting targeted goals.

🔴  Project Stopped/Canceled.

⭐  Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I**  Infrastructure Project

P  Project completed and PIER received

**C**  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A**  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

▽  Project on hold.

⊕  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

⬮  Reporting insufficient.

*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERS) (Continued)
### Sharp Interface

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | To Be Determined | (Est. planning, execution, close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | To Be Determined | |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 1/1/11 | Est. Close-Out End:      1/1/12 |

CITO Proj Notification:    9/25/08
Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
   Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
KPERS Fund                    To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):  Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  A direct interface with SHARP will provide KPERS with most if not all of the data currently reported through annual contribution reporting and eliminate many reporting requirements. Additionally this direct interface would facilitate processing of benefit estimates and retirements.

**E-Governmen**t:  N/A

**Technical Architecture**:  The SHARP interface will comply with the Kansas Information Technology Architecture Standards

**Project Description and Scope:**  Unknown at this time

**Project Status:**  Concept

**Planned**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬮ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*   +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR)
### CDL Electronic Knowledge Testing Equipment

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $252,459** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) | | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $58,272** | | |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 12/15/08 | Est. Close-Out End: | 10/29/09 |
| | | CITO Proj Notification: | 3/26/09 |
| | | Identified by Agency | |

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
Federal Grant Money from Department of Transportation          100%

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  This equipment is currently being utilized at eight issuance locations which provide CDL testing for only a portion of the state.  The purpose of this project is to expand the electronic knowledge testing equipment and its related benefits to the remaining 19 CDL driver's license issuance locations in Kansas.  This expansion will allow Kansas to improve the safety of commercial drivers throughout the state.

**E-Government:**  The electronic CDL knowledge testing equipment will enhance testing security and help prevent fraudulent practices and other possible abuse.  The use of automated testing equipment deters fraud by customers who pass copies of the written exams to their friends or by a group of customers who each memorize a different question on the exam and as a group recreate the exam and its answers.  The equipment will provide electronic tracking and help prohibit examiners from altering the score received by entering a fraudulent value.  The electronic knowledge testing equipment will also provide the ability to deliver exams through headphones for those with hearing issues.

**Technical Architecture:**  This expansion will include purchasing hardware and software with grant funds from Juno, Inc. which supports the existing electronic knowledge testing equipment in use in Kansas.  A new server will be purchased from state contract to support the expanded number of locations and an integrated database.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The electronic knowledge testing equipment administers the eight different types of CDL examinations at the issuance locations where it is installed.  The results of these exams are used to determine eligibility for issuance of a CDL.  The test questions are randomly generated from the pool of questions approved in 2005 by the American Association of Motor Vehicles

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*          **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR) (Continued)
### CDL Electronic Knowledge Testing Equipment (Continued)

Administrators in the CDL Knowledge Test pool of questions. The use of the electronic equipment will help ensure the validity and reliability of knowledge test administration.

The electronic CDL knowledge testing equipment will enhance testing security and help prevent fraudulent practices and other possible abuse. The use of automated testing equipment deters fraud by customers who pass copies of the written exams to their friends or by a group of customers who each memorize a different question on the exam and as a group recreate the exam and its answers. The equipment will provide electronic tracking and help prohibit examiners from altering the score received by entering a fraudulent value. The electronic knowledge testing equipment will also provide the ability to deliver exams through headphones for those with hearing issues.

The installation of equipment statewide will allow the CDL examination data to be integrated into a database automatically, thereby, reducing human error, increasing the speed of data entry and improving the completeness of the data entered. The statewide use of electronic testing equipment will also modernize Kansas' CDL knowledge test administration so it can be integrated with the Department's data processing modernization.

**Project Status:** The project is on hold awaiting grant review and award.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR)
### International Fuel Tax Agreement (Replacement)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out) | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | To Be Determined | |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 7/1/09 | |

Est. Close-Out End:        6/30/10
CITO Proj Notification:     9/25/08
Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
  Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
Federal Grant (CVISN Grant)          100%

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The on-going Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) state plan which attempts to get organization computer systems and personnel to communicate with each other.  The KHP, KDOR, KCC, and KDOT have been pursuing grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation- Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration in efforts to achieve this objective.

The existing Kansas International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA) is a mainframe based application that was developed by KDOR Information Services associates and last written in 1994. Our current registration system for IFTA utilizes the Taxpayer Registration System (TRS) which is a separate system than the taxpayer accounting system. IFTA was written in Natural Construct and utilizes an ADABAS database management system. This project will replace IFTA with a web-based solution for issuing Motor Carriers License, Renewals, Decal Orders, and temporary decal permits which is accessible to citizens, businesses and government.

The replacement of the current mainframe system and the Kansas.gov permit application allows for a fully integrated application that will provide all functions and processes from a single database.

Currently, we have 3,461 active IFTA accounts licensed. We are required to verify any new IFTA licensee to ensure they have not been previously or are currently licensed in another jurisdiction with a noncompliance standing.

**E-Government:**  Implementing the IFTA replacement will provide a more efficient workflow process and improve the customer service provided by the IFTA staff.
1. IFTA filing of original and amended Returns, New IFTA Licenses, Renewals, Decals     orders,     and temporary decal permits.
2. The new system will be available 24/7 from any location and will allow staff to provide   support     for law enforcement in a timely manner.
3. Currently, IFTA processes 56% percent for quarterly returns and 35% percent of the renewals are filed electronically.  The down side is this requires IS intervention to pull the information into our system.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      ✛  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR) (Continued)
### International Fuel Tax Agreement (Replacement) (Continued)

4. The new system will provide for incident tracking (i.e. improves safety by identifying noncompliant carriers.)
5. Supports distribution of compliance and safety information to enforcement officials at the roadside via a state-of-the-art secure communication backbone.
6. Improves the fuel tax transaction process.
7. Communicate with other agencies computer system.
8. Obtain access to Kansas CVIEW via the internet in order to query carrier and vehicle safety information for use in roadside enforcement activities.

**Technical Architecture:** Will be consistent with KDOR's approved direction for system architecture, but the exact specifics have not been determined.

**Project Description and Scope:** It is the purpose of IFTA to promote and encourage the fullest and most efficient possible use of the highway system by making uniform the administration of motor fuels use taxation laws with respect to motor vehicles operated in multiple member jurisdictions; to establish and maintain the concept of one fuel use license and administering base jurisdiction for each Kansas licensee. IFTA is dedicated to application of cost-effective intelligent transportation technologies and streamlining existing process that will improve transportation safety and administration efficiency of both motor carriers and the state.

The KDOR IFTA section is responsible for the issuance of motor carrier License, Return filing, Renewal, Decal orders and temporary decal permits.
- The application will maintain a financial database and have the ability to create accounting, production and various ad-hoc reports.
- The system will provide the ability to accept and issue IFTA applications using an electronic file format.
- IFTA new registration system. - currently using the Taxpayer Registration System (TRS).
- The new system will be available 24/7 from any location and will allow staff to provide support for law enforcement in a timely manner.
- The new web based application will provide easier access to other agencies.
- The IFTA team receives and sends transmittals and money to and from other jurisdictions.
- System will allow for split tax rates for another jurisdiction (Jurisdiction changes a tax rate during the middle of a quarter.)
- Ability to adjust the interest rate, if needed.
- Communication with Other Jurisdictions, UCR, KCC, IRP, PVD, IFTA Clearinghouse, Counties, VIPS Replacement system, CVIEW, and USDOT.
- Improved correspondence features.
- Improved audit capabilities.

**Project Status:** Planning

**Planned**

| | Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | | | Reporting insufficient. |

\* *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     ✚ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR) (Continued)
### Motor Carrier Central Permit (Replacement)

CITO Approval:                     Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:            $1,125,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: $79,200**
Estimated Planning Start:          7/1/09              Est. Close-Out End:        6/30/10
                                                       CITO Proj Notification:    9/25/08
                                                       Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
                                                         Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
Federal Grant (CVISN Grant)              100%

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The existing Kansas Motor Carrier permit system is the Motor Carrier Central Permit (MCCP).  It is a mainframe-based application that was developed by KDOR Information Services associates and last re-written in 1995. The system is written in Natural Construct and utilizes an ADABAS database management system.  This project will replace MCCP with a web-based solution for issuing motor carrier legalization permits, which is accessible to citizens, businesses and government.

The replacement of the current mainframe system and the Kansas.gov permit application allows for a fully integrated application that will provide all functions and processes from a single database.

The number of Super Load permits issued has risen dramatically in the last few years (from 432 in 1999 to 6,404 in 2007).  Much of the recent increase is due to the movement of wind towers into, or through, the state.

Statistics show that freight traffic will double in the next 15 years.  Railroads are building capacity to meet the demand, but the excess will be taken up by trucking companies.

The current routing process is a cumbersome manual process.  Multiple paper maps and KDOT web applications are involved in determining an acceptable route for an oversize/overweight load.

**E-Government:**  Implementing the MCCP replacement will provide a more efficient workflow process and improve the customer service provided by the Kansas Trucking Connection staff.
1. KDOT is developing a routing system for use on oversize / overweight loads traveling on Kansas Highways.  This project will allow KDOR to leverage all of the features being developed by the KDOT routing system.

**Planned**

| Symbol | Meaning | Symbol | Meaning |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR) (Continued)
### Motor Carrier Central Permit (Replacement) (Continued)

2. The new system will require a requestor to identify the carrier responsible for safety of the load; web service calls will insure the carrier is in compliance with all safety regulations prior to           issuing        a permit.
3. The new system will be available 24/7 from any location and will allow staff to provide support for law enforcement in a timely manner.
4. Currently Kansas processes 25% percent of the permits electronically.  The state of Nebraska implemented an integrated permit and routing system and is reporting 64% of its permits being processes electronically.
5. The new system will provide for incident tracking (i.e. pulled permits and hit bridges) base on reports by the KHP.
6. The new system will provide enhanced tracking for Annual permit users.
7. The new system will provide reports for overweight loads and the routes traveled by these loads.

**Technical Architecture:**  Will be consistent with KDOR's approved direction for system architecture, but the exact specifics have not been determined.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The KDOR Motor Carrier Services Bureau is responsible for the issuance of motor carrier permits.  Motor carrier permits include several types of permits including oversize /overweight, registration, fuel and harvest permits.  The different permit types require unique business processing rules and distribution of the funds collected.
   o KDOT is developing a routing system for use on oversize / overweight loads traveling on Kansas Highways.  This project will allow KDOR to leverage all of the features being developed by the KDOT routing system.
   o The new system will require a requestor to identify the carrier responsible for safety of the load; web service calls will insure the carrier is in compliance with all safety regulations prior to issuing a permit.
   o The application will maintain a financial database and have the ability to create accounting, production and various ad-hoc reports.
   o  The system will provide the ability to accept and issue permit applications using an electronic file format.
   o The new system will be available 24/7 from any location and will allow staff to provide support for law enforcement in a timely manner.
   o KDOR provides access to the MCCP application to KHP Motor Carrier Stations.  The new web based application will provide easier access to the KHP and MCSB staff.

**Project Status:**  Planning

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🏉 | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Social and Rehabilitation Services, Department of SRS)
### Human Services Management (HSM)

CITO Approval:                          Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                 $98,500,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined
Estimated Planning Start:               To Be Determined   Est. Close-Out End:To Be Determined
                                                           CITO Proj Notification:    2/19/07
                                                           Identified by Agency

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**The $98.5 million is determined from a Feasibility Study developed by the Forrester Research Group and completed in June 2006.   In the Study, Forrester suggested three (3) different implementation strategies for the Integration and Modernization Options for SRS.  The $98.5 million represents the total cost of implementing option one (1) which is the Implementation of Packaged Applications to Replace SRS Applications.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The mission of the State of Kansas is to provide services Kansans want and need in the most cost effective and responsible manner.  To further the mission, SRS wishes to implement an HSM system that will include an Integrated Service Delivery model to better serve Kansans.  HSM will be a business and technology project to produce outcome-based, client-centered, integrated delivery of services across needs-based and contribution-based programs. HSM will provide SRS with a comprehensive view of a client across programs in order to integrate service delivery and achieve positive outcomes. This will be accomplished by implementing an integrated infrastructure approach. This approach will allow multiple programs to be supported, using consistent and standard-based technology and management practices.  By taking a customer-focused approach to serving Kansans in place of the normal "stove piped" program approach, more effective service delivery can be provided by better determining the services that Kansans are eligible for by providing a single interface to various programs.  This approach will make the transition from a traditional, program-driven approach to a client-centered, outcome-based environment using an integrated service delivery model.

**E-Government:**  To provide the most automated methods for delivering SRS government services through multiple customer-oriented service channels.

**Technical Architecture:**  The architecture will be developed as a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) following industry best practices, within State of Kansas guidelines.  SOA provides greater flexibility for the interaction of multiple applications and business units.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The scope of this project is to implement modern integrated IT systems which enable the delivery of SRS services in a client-focused, outcome driven manner.

**Project Status:**  The details of this project will be developed during the Human Services Management (HSM) Roadmap.  When the HSM Roadmap is complete, additional documentation for this project will follow.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | 🪐 | Reporting insufficient. |

\*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    ✛   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)
### Capital Inventory Management System

CITO Approval:                          Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                 To Be Determined  (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined
Estimated Planning Start:               7/1/12            Est. Close-Out End:        6/30/13
                                                          CITO Proj Notification:    9/25/08
                                                          Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
                                                            Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The current Capital Inventory system was custom developed in the mid 1980's.  Although this application was upgrade to DB2 in the past, the environment it resides in has become more difficult to support and upgrade. The ability to integrate the information contained within this application with new KDOT applications has become an issue for continued development.  KDOT business requirements have changed significantly.  This system has undergone several modifications, the design has remained unchanged.  New data requirements and business rules continually evolve requiring work arounds for the system.  This Capital inventory system is utilized across the state in all KDOT offices and locations.  A replacement for Capital Inventory would allow KDOT to take advantage of new business needs and allow KDOT to expose the KDOT asset data to new systems.

**E-Government:**  At this time, this system is not planned to have e-government utilization.

**Technical Architecture:**  Will be consistent with KDOT's approved direction for systems architecture, but specifics have not been determined.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The scope of this project would be to replace the existing Capital Inventory system.  This system will maintain the inventory of equipment and capital expenditures by category and location.  Inventory subsystems include; building, land, materials, office equipment, radios, shop equipment and storage areas. This system would be designed to provide a solution for KDOT agency wide.  This system has interfaces to multiple KDOT systems; interfaces would also be addressed to insure that existing systems would maintain functionality.  As the state Department of Administration proceeds with its new FMS replacement application, KDOT would review the capabilities and functionality provided with that system. The new FMS system has included an Asset management module within the project scope.

**Project Status:**  Planning.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*      **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)
### Consumable Inventory Management System

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | To Be Determined | (Est. planning, execution, close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | To Be Determined | |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 7/1/11 | |

Est. Close-Out End:          6/30/12
CITO Proj Notification:     9/25/08
Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
   Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  The current Consumable Inventory system was custom developed in the mid 1980's.  The software technology (VSAM, CICS, Cobol) utilized to build this application has become functionally obsolete. The primary file structure has proven to be incompatible with new emerging technologies.  The ability to integrate the information contained within this application with new KDOT applications has become an issue for continued development.  KDOT has also had the desire to utilize 'bar' coding technologies for inventory.  Bar coding solutions will not work in the current technical architecture.  This system is utilized across the state in all KDOT offices and locations.  By implementing a new system, including the bar coding technology would allow KDOT to upgrade systems to take advantage of new business needs and allow KDOT to expose the consumable data to new systems.

**E-Government:**  At this time, this system is not planned to have e-government utilization.

**Technical Architecture:**  Will be consistent with KDOT's approved direction for systems architecture, but specifics have not been determined.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The scope of this project would be to replace the existing 25 year old consumable inventory system.  Consumable inventory system is responsible for maintaining inventory locations, stock item descriptions, process receipts issues and transfers. This system would be designed to provide a solution for KDOT storekeeper's agency wide.  This would include a bar coding solution for inventory management.  This legacy system has interfaces to multiple KDOT systems, including Crew Card; Interfaces would also be addressed to insure that existing systems would maintain functionality.  As the state Department of Administration proceeds with its new FMS replacement application, KDOT would review the capabilities and functionality provided with that system.  Although the new FMS system did not include Consumable inventory as within scope, the selected software could provide an integrated tracking a procurement system at a later implementation.

**Project Status:**  Planning.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 | Meeting targeted goals. | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 | Project Stopped/Canceled. | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ | Project completed and waiting for PIER. | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** | Infrastructure Project | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P | Project completed and PIER received | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

**\***  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        **+**  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

**Document Management System Replacement**

CITO Approval:                          Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost:                 $300,000-$600,000**  (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined
Estimated Planning Start:               4/1/10                Est. Close-Out End:        12/30/10
                                                             CITO Proj Notification:     9/25/08
                                                             Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
                                                               Budget Plans


Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined


**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**


**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  To upgrade or replace the existing technology before the products are technically obsolete and become unsupported.

**E-Government:**  Not applicable.

**Technical Architecture:**  The technology will be upgraded or replaced.  The current architecture is a web-based system and the intent is to maintain this direction.

**Project Description and Scope:**  The project will include upgrading or replacing five production document management libraries.  If the products are replaced then a major conversion effort will be necessary to move the documents to the new technology.  Currently there are over two million documents.

**Project Status:**  Budget has been approved in Fiscal Year 2009 to analyze the existing system, evaluate existing products, and determine an approach.  The project is planned for Fiscal Year 2010.

**Planned**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⊘ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*        +   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)
### Oversize/Overweight Vehicle Routing & Permitting System

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested | | |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $1,025,000-$2,100,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) | | |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $600,000** | | |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 7/1/11 | Est. Close-Out End: | 6/30/12 |
| | | CITO Proj Notification: | 9/25/08 |

Identified in Agency IT Mgmt &
  Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate.  When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):**  It is the responsibility of KDOT to route superload trucks (with loads greater than 150,000 pounds or having axle weights greater than what the standard permit allows) through the state of Kansas.  This task is completed by the Bridge Management department at KDOT and the Kansas Trucking Connection (KTC).  Currently the state does this process manually with the use of a Microsoft Access '97 database system to analyze the route, and BRASS software to analyze the bridges over which the trucks will pass. KDOT also works in conjunction with KTC who receives the majority of the superload permit requests and who is responsible for accepting payment and issuing permits.  This process has become cumbersome and outdated.  Automating the process will give KDOT the opportunity to work with KTC and provide a more efficient and convenient way for truckers transporting superloads through Kansas to gain permits.  By collecting the data electronically, this will also allow greater analysis to be conducted on the effects of superloads on Kansas highways.

**E-Government:**  It is the desire of KDOT to have this system available via the internet to allow potential users the flexibility to complete an application and pay for a permit 24/7.  Approved permits will be routed to the requester electronically, allowing them to print the permit themselves.

**Technical Architecture:**  Will be consistent with KDOT's approved direction for systems architecture, but the specifics have not yet been determined

**Project Description and Scope:**  To replace the current BOPRS Access database and manual process, KDOT will look for a new system that will collect, route, and issue permits.  The system will be accessed via a web browser and will be hosted at KDOT.  The system will be available to truckers wishing to get superload permits, while KDOT and KTC will use the system to perform routing and analysis functions.  The new application will be integrated with other systems at KDOT, including BRASS and CPMS.  The system will adhere to the standards and strategies of KDOT's enterprise data system, including security and horizontal integration.

**Project Status:**  Planning

**Planned**

**Return to Index**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙂 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | ⬭ | Reporting insufficient. |

\*  *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*     +  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## REGENTS

## Pittsburgh State University (PSU)
### Replacement Integrated Library System

| | |
|---|---|
| CITO Approval: | Not Yet Requested |
| Estimated Project Cost: | $500,000 - $650,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out) |
| Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: | $176,000** |
| Estimated Planning Start: | 11/07 |

Estimated Close-Out End: 3/08
CITO Proj Notification: 5/18/07
Identified by Agency

<u>Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost</u>
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** Pittsburg State University contracted for an Integrated Library System (ILS) from Dynix, Inc. in 1990. The software currently being used will no longer be enhanced and will not be supported at sometime in the future 5-10 years. Due to the lack of any further enhancements, the University cannot make improvements to its on-line access to library materials, a key component of teaching and research at the University. It is imperative that the current ILS be replaced as soon as possible. The contract was later amended on November 6, 2006, to include the addition of several consortium partners with a new amount of $227,242. The contract was for a software package, Horizon/ Corinthian, with a release level of 8.1 or higher. The original timeline called for a ³go live² date in January 2006. As the company was delayed in development, the implementation date was moved back several times with the last scheduled date of September 19, 2007. On March 13, 2007, an e-mail was received from SirsiDynix announcing that all development of the Horizon / Corinthian software package was being stopped by the company and that customers would be directed to another software product from the company. That was followed up by a brief telephone call two days later. The University attorney has been able to recover all of the monies previously expended for this contract and arranged for continued maintenance until the system can be replaced.

**E-Government:** The current ILS, as will its replacement, enables all users with Internet access to locate PSU library resources. Users may use electronic forms for Interlibrary Loan, access digital materials in the University's special collections and archives, and view licensed databases using a proxy server. Transfer of payments is not anticipated using this system.

**Technical Architecture:** No changes are anticipated to current workflows in library operations. The proposed procurement is a replacement for an existing system and capabilities will be of the same general nature as are in the current system. The proposed procurement will meet all existing academic library standards including Z39.50 allowing for interoperability between ILS systems. Each Regents University operates its own ILS and, other than meeting library standard architectures, there is no advantage to sharing such systems between Universities. Currently, PSU hosts ILS functions for Fort Scott Community College, Eureka Public Library, Pittsburg Public Library, and USD 250 (Pittsburg Schools), and is in the process of adding additional partners through the Southeast Kansas Library System.

**Project Description and Scope:** Due to the situation in which we currently are operating, we intend to proceed with a new purchase as soon as practical. Project Management documents will be submitted to the KITO office in the near future.

**Project Status:** Axe Library is in the process of gathering information on potential library systems. Three ILS software vendors have been requested to demonstrate their capabilities to meet the needs of the University. All have responded that they are interested in doing so and demonstrations have been scheduled in May. A detailed list of desired functionalities has been provided to each vendor for planning their demonstrations and an additional list of written questions has been forwarded to each vendor. No pricing information, RFQ, nor RFP has been requested from any vendor.

**Planned**

**Return to Index**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 😊 Meeting targeted goals. | | **C** | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| 🔴 Project Stopped/Canceled. | | **A** | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). |
| ⭐ Project completed and waiting for PIER. | | ▽ | Project on hold. |
| **I** Infrastructure Project | | ⊕ | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER received | | 🥏 | Reporting insufficient. |

**\*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*    **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

# SYMBOLS

Project meeting targeted goals.

Project completed and waiting for closeout PIER

P   PIER received.

C   Caution - Project has changed scope, or missed targeted goals by more than 10 percent. Reporting to the Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) may be recommended.

A   Alert - Project has changed scope, or missed targeted goals by more than 20 percent. Reporting to the Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) may be recommended.

Project has changed scope, or missed targeted goals by more than 20 percent. Review and report to JCIT and CITO required. Review by 3rd party may be recommended. Symbol can also mean project has been stopped or canceled.

Project on hold.

Recast – Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

I   Infrastructure Project.

Reporting insufficient.

+   Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology.

*   *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*